

BROWNSON'S
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1849.

ART. I. — *Outlines of History, compiled for the Use of Schools and Academies.* By PIERCE C. GRACE. St. Louis : Wm. J. Mullin. 1848. 32mo. pp. 216.

THIS little volume is intended to supply a serious deficiency in our historical manuals, and we should owe an apology to its publisher for not having sooner introduced it to our readers, if it were not one of those works which are as valuable this year as they were the last. Mr. Grace has compiled it with commendable industry and praiseworthy motives ; the Catholic press of the country has given it a favorable reception ; and, though it is hardly up with the present state of historical science, or always as scrupulously accurate in its statements as we could wish in a work intended for childhood and youth, we can cheerfully recommend it as the best work of the sort, within so moderate a compass, we are aware of in our language.

Our present purpose in calling attention to this little manual of history is not, however, to criticize it favorably or unfavorably, but to make it the occasion of offering some brief, and, we trust, not unseasonable, remarks on the subject of civil and religious toleration, which its compiler brings to our notice in the two following extracts : —

“ In 1620, during the reign of *James I.*, the first permanent settlement was commenced in *New England*, at *Plymouth*, in *Massachusetts*, by a band of *Puritans*, — a class of religionists, who, abandoning England on account of persecution from the established church, sought in the wilds of America the enjoyment of religious liberty. They had scarcely, however, established themselves in the New World, before they themselves exhibited even greater intoler-

ance than that from which they fled, and most cruelly persecuted all who differed from them in religious belief."— p. 183.

"In 1633, during the reign of *Charles I.*, *Lord Baltimore*, a Catholic nobleman, and a man of distinguished talents, applied for and obtained a grant of land upon *Chesapeake Bay*, about 140 miles long and 130 broad. Soon after, in consequence of persecution in England, on account of their religion, Lord Baltimore and a number of Catholics came over and settled on this grant, which, in honor of the queen, *Henrietta Maria*, they named *Maryland*. The history of this colony presents, in several important respects, a striking and most pleasing contrast to that of most of the other colonies. Universal toleration of religion was, for the first time on this continent, proclaimed and protected by this colony, and a system of equity and humanity was scrupulously observed in all its dealings with the Indians. The historian, *Bancroft*, in speaking of the settlement of Maryland, says:— 'Its history is the history of benevolence, gratitude, and toleration. The Roman Catholics, who were oppressed by the laws of England, were sure to find a peaceful asylum in the quiet harbours of the Chesapeake; and there, too, Protestants were sheltered from Protestant intolerance.'"— pp. 184, 185.

Toleration, or, to be more exact, religious liberty, is in every one's mouth, and the constant theme of declamation with all who would depreciate their ancestors, glorify themselves, or win the applause of the multitude; but, unless we are greatly deceived, it is a theme on which there is much loose writing, and still more loose speaking and thinking. Comparatively few appear to us to understand it, or to have any passable appreciation of its reach and conditions. All men, in words at least, are stanch friends of religious liberty, ready to live and die in its defence; but the great majority seem to us to mistake it for the liberty to deny and to enslave religion. The early Protestant sects, who, wherever they were able, subjected religion to the secular authority, fined, imprisoned, exiled, or martyred Catholics, claimed to be the friends of religious freedom, and the liberators of religion from spiritual despotism; the old French Jacobins plundered churches, suppressed the freedom of worship, abolished the Sabbath, overturned altars as well as thrones, massacred the clergy, decreed that death is an eternal sleep, and installed the goddess of Reason, under the pretence of religious liberty, and amid deafening proclamations of universal toleration; the present Socialists, Radicals, or Red Republicans of France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Switzerland, profess to be fighting under the flag of religious no less than of civil

liberty, and yet their successes are everywhere marked by insults to religion, the expulsion of the religious, the spoliation of churches and convents, and the persecution of the clergy. The most superficial observer can hardly fail to perceive that the age understands, by religious liberty, not the freedom to worship God in the way and manner he prescribes, but the freedom not to worship him at all, — the freedom to enslave or suppress his worship, to plunder his temples, to desecrate his altars, to deny his existence, to blaspheme his majesty, to trample on his laws, and to live like the beasts that perish.

But, although we are anxious to avoid every unnecessary quarrel with our age, we must tell it, that this is no religious liberty at all, that it is the enslavement of religion, where not its total extinction, and the freedom of irreligion, infidelity, heresy, and schism. Religious liberty, as we understand it, is THE ABSOLUTE FREEDOM OF RELIGION, IN ITS DOCTRINES, DISCIPLINE, AND WORSHIP, FROM ALL HUMAN AUTHORITY, and therefore implies the ABSOLUTE INCOMPETENCY, IN SPIRITUALS, OF ALL HUMAN AUTHORITY, WHETHER PUBLIC OR PRIVATE. We say the absolute freedom of *religion*; by which we, of course, mean the true, that is, the Catholic religion. Consequently, we recognize no religious liberty where our Church is not free in her doctrine, discipline, and worship, and where all men have not full and entire freedom to profess the Catholic religion without restraint from, or responsibility to, any human power whatever, whether vested in the king, the aristocracy, or the people. Where this freedom is wanting, there is no religious liberty. This freedom we demand, not as a favor, not as a gracious concession from the prince or the republic, but as our right, as the indefeasible right of our Church, for the reason that she is the Church of God, the representative of the Divine sovereignty on the earth; and this freedom we are bound in conscience to assert, and to vindicate, if need be, as did the early Christian martyrs under the persecuting emperors of pagan Rome, not indeed by slaying, but by submitting to be slain.

From this view of religious liberty, it is evident, that, when we speak of *toleration*, we have and can have no reference to our Church; for she holds immediately from God, and we recognize no power on earth that has the right to restrain her worship, and therefore none that has the right to *tolerate* it. The question of toleration, raised in the extracts from the little work before us, lies below the question of religious liberty, and

relates solely to false religions, — to infidel, heretical, and schismatical sects. Are these to be tolerated, or are they to be prohibited? Shall we assert the natural right of every man to choose his own religion, or shall we assert, and as far as able enforce, the moral obligation of all men to profess the true religion? Shall we be intolerant and exclusive, or assert and maintain universal toleration? This is the question.

To answer this question, we must distinguish between two sorts of toleration, — political or civil toleration, and religious or theological toleration; that is, toleration of false religions in the temporal order, and toleration of the same in the spiritual order. These two tolerations are often confounded, and supposed to be inseparably connected. Hence many assert religious or theological toleration as the condition of justifying the assertion of political or civil toleration, and many also deny political toleration, in order, as they suppose, not to be obliged to assert religious toleration. But the two are in reality distinct, and one has no necessary connection with, or dependence on, the other. Political toleration of religion is the permission conceded by princes or republics to their subjects to profess the religion they choose; religious toleration is the permission granted by Almighty God to all men to profess any religion they please, or none at all, and implies the equal right, or the indifference, of all religions before God, or in reference to eternal life. Universal political toleration presupposes that all religions are compatible with the peace and safety of civil society; universal religious toleration presupposes that all religions are acceptable to God, and available for salvation. The state regards religion solely under its relation to social interests, and the theologian regards it primarily in its relation to the future life or the salvation of the soul. It is easy, therefore, if we understand the distinction of the two orders, to see that it is possible to be politically tolerant and yet religiously intolerant, if not politically intolerant and yet religiously tolerant.

The question of the political toleration of religion we shall consider at some length before we close; but, for the moment, we must confine ourselves to religious or theological toleration. Religious or theological toleration is what is commonly called *Indifferentism*, — that is, the doctrine that men may be saved in all religions, in one as well as in another, or that every one may be saved in his own religion, the religion of his country, or of his sect. To concede this doctrine is religious or theological toleration, as distinguished from political or civil toleration; to

deny it is religious or theological intolerance and exclusiveness, expressed in the Catholic dogma, "Out of the Church there is no salvation." Whatever conclusion we may or may not come to on the subject of political toleration, or the indifference of religions before society and the civil authority, we must, unless bereft of reason, be religiously or theologically intolerant and exclusive; for toleration in the spiritual order is, at bottom, neither more nor less than the denial of the religious principle itself.

Certain is it, from natural reason, that no man can be saved unless he renders to God an acceptable worship, and that no worship is or can be acceptable to God, except the worship which he himself prescribes. Moreover, it is equally certain, that no man can be saved who does not, at least, fulfil the law of nature. By the very law of nature, all men are bound to worship God, and to worship him in the way and manner he himself prescribes. If he leaves them to the natural law, and prescribes his worship only through natural reason, undoubtedly such worship as they can render by a prudent, diligent, honest use of reason, and the means bestowed for such purpose, will be the acceptable worship, and all that can in justice be demanded of them; but if he prescribes a supernatural religion, and promulgates it with sufficient motives of credibility, as he must needs do if he promulgates it at all, then are they bound to worship him according to that supernatural religion, — bound by the very law of nature itself to receive and practise it; and they want even natural morality if they do not. Such a religion, with sufficient motives of credibility, he has prescribed in Christianity. How, then, can we assert the indifference of religions, and contend for religious toleration? Since God prescribes the Christian religion, the law of nature, as well as of revelation, binds us to believe and obey it. If we do not, we fail to fulfil the law of nature, as well as to render the acceptable worship, and are convicted of sin under both the natural law and the revealed. How, then, can we hope to be saved?

Christianity and Catholicity, at least in the faith of Catholics, are identical, — one and the same thing. We do and can recognize no Christianity, properly so called, out of the Catholic Church. We recognize, indeed, in those who are out of her communion, many human excellences, many noble and generous sentiments, many amiable and philanthropic qualities, many just and profound thoughts, many estimable, private, domestic, and civil virtues, which we delight to honor, and which will

have their reward in their own order, as St. Austin teaches us in regard to the ancient Romans ; but we recognize in them no supernatural faith or sanctity, nothing distinctively Christian, nothing meritorious of eternal life. Out of the Church there is no Christian religion, and therefore, if no salvation out of the Christian religion, none out of the Church, as the Church herself expressly teaches, and has solemnly defined in her general councils. "He cannot," says St. Cyprian, "have God for his father who will not have the Church for his mother." To concede religious toleration, or the indifference of religions, is neither more nor less than to deny the Christian religion itself, and to give up our faith as Catholics. If you require us to do this, you deny our right to be Christians, and are yourselves, even in defending toleration, intolerant ; if you concede our right to be Christians, you concede the right of religious intolerance, and then have no right to assert or to demand religious tolerance.

Every man is obliged, by the constitution of the human mind itself, and the very nature of things; to assert the principle of religious intolerance and exclusiveness. We know by natural reason, without revelation, that there is and can be but one true religion ; for truth is one, individual, and most simple. This one true religion is necessarily the one which God himself institutes or prescribes ; all other religions are false religions, and to suppose that one can be saved in a false religion is absurd and impious ; for it is to place truth and falsehood on the same footing, and to suppose that God, who is truth itself, makes no difference between them, that is, counts falsehood as if it were truth ! A man cannot believe this, unless he gives up reason ; nor even then, for without reason he can believe nothing at all. Indeed, all truth, all good, all opinions even, are and must be intolerant and exclusive. Truth cannot tolerate error, or even the semblance of error ; good excludes evil ; right excludes wrong ; holiness excludes unholiness. Nothing in the universe tolerates its opposite. In regard to all things we are obliged to assert a right and a wrong, a true and a false, and whoever asserts the one necessarily denies the other. Even he who asserts the indifference of all religions denies their difference, and is, in a manner, himself intolerant and exclusive. Hence we see, in our own days, sects formed against sectarianism ; and Dr. Bushnell, just now one of our New England "lions," is busy, consciously or unconsciously, in rallying a party around his pretended Christian dogma, that there are no Christian

dogmas, and should be none. Every man, who believes in any religion at all, believes his own religion is the true religion, the only true religion, and therefore that all other religions are false religions. He must, then, either believe that salvation is attainable in no other religion, or else that it is attainable in a false religion ; which, as we have seen, is absurd. If he believes his religion is the true religion, he believes it is the religion that all men are bound to believe, — for truth, like right, is obligatory, — and therefore believes that all men are prohibited from believing any other. Every man must, then, do or say what he will, be religiously intolerant and exclusive.

As Catholics, it is well known that we are obliged, by our very religion, as well as by natural reason itself, to deny religious indifference, and to maintain the impossibility, *in hac providentia*, of salvation out of our Church. This may offend fashionable latitudinarianism, but it is nothing that we should hesitate, or in the least degree be afraid, to avow ; for no severer sentence can be pronounced upon any pretended faith or church, than that it fears to assert its own indispensableness to salvation. What is it, in fact, we want a faith or church for, but to save us ? and what reason have we, or can we have, for embracing any particular faith or church, but that we cannot be saved without it ? A faith or church that concedes the possibility of salvation in another, or outside of itself, confesses that it is not the one true faith or church of God, — therefore, virtually, that it is a false faith or church, unacceptable to God, pernicious to the souls of men, and to be eschewed by all, as they fear hell or hope for heaven. Hence all Protestant sects, of past and present times, are condemned out of their own mouths ; for not one of them has, or ever has had, the courage or the audacity to assert that there is no salvation out of its communion, — that is, if we understand the matter, the courage or the audacity, without contradicting itself and conceding the contrary, to assert its own truth. This, perhaps, is a fact not insignificant. Falsehood is, by its own nature, compelled to lie unto itself as well as unto others.

The age, we grant, demands religious toleration, and religious indifference is the order of the day. Many are shocked, or affect to be shocked, when they hear us say that there is no salvation out of the Catholic Church ; they allege that it is harsh, illiberal, uncharitable to say so ; and even some of our own Catholic friends, now and then, try to persuade themselves and their dissenting brethren that this is going a little beyond the

mark, and savors somewhat of bigotry and indiscreet zeal. But he has little claim either to moral or to logical consistency, who refuses to say the true religion is the true religion ; and, certainly, there cannot be much bigotry or indiscreet zeal, if we use the terms in their ordinary sense, in asserting that the Catholic religion is the true religion. But he who so asserts necessarily asserts that all other religions are false, and therefore, either that it is possible to be saved in a false religion, or that there is no salvation out of the Catholic Church. More liberal or tolerant than this we cannot be, in the very nature of things, if we would, unless we could be foolish enough to contradict ourselves, and maintain, that, of contraries, both may be true.

However this may be, as Catholics we have nothing to do with liberality or illiberality in the matter. We have not instituted the laws of mind, and they remain unchanged, whether we conform to them or not. We do not make, and cannot unmake, the truth ; and it is eternally and immutably the same, whether we assert it or deny it. It is not *our* truth ; it in no sense whatever depends on our intellects, our wills, or our affections ; and whether it pleases or displeases us or our friends, appears to us or to them liberal or illiberal, we have just as little power as right to alter it. Should we seek to conceal it, to soften it, or to explain it away, we could only sully the chastity or destroy the integrity of our own faith, and confirm the unbelieving and misbelieving in their dangerous delusions. Still would it be as true as ever, that our religion is the only true religion, and that there is salvation in no other. The solemn truth, that out of the Church no one can ever be saved, would remain in all its force, unaffected by our concessions. Knowing this, — knowing that it is the truth which liberates, — we dare not conceal it, and are bound in Christian charity to proclaim it. We must not mistake natural sympathy and good feeling, or the natural kindness or softness of our tempers, for Christian charity. Christian charity, certainly, never gratuitously offends, — is never harsh, bitter, or censorious, — is always meek, gentle, affectionate, kind ; but it seeks, always and everywhere, the substantial good of its objects, even at the risk of giving them momentary displeasure or pain ; and, unhappily, in this perverse world, men generally have the most repugnance to that which is the most essential to their everlasting welfare.

We are not ignorant that many persons object to the intolerance and exclusiveness we assert, — that is, to the Catholic

dogma, Out of the Church no one can ever be saved, — not only that it is harsh and illiberal, but that it is contrary even to the justice of God ; for it implies, they say, that he will consign men to eternal tortures for not doing what they have never had the power to do. To punish men for not doing what has never been in their power to do is, we grant, unjust, and we may be well assured that our God will never do it. But the objection has no validity, unless it be true that there are persons who live and die without ever having it in their power to become joined to the Catholic communion ; consequently, they who urge this objection must prove that there are such persons, before they can have any right to insist on it, or we be under any obligation even to entertain it. An objection which rests for its validity on an uncertain principle, or an unproved assumption, proves nothing, and may always be dismissed without an answer. But is the assumption the objection makes even provable ? We know that our religion has been promulgated in all the earth for eighteen hundred years, and, as far as we know anything of the matter, that, if there is any nation to which it has not been preached, it has been that nation's own fault, because it would not receive, but repelled with insult and persecution, her Divinely-commissioned preachers. We know, also, that sufficient grace is given unto every man, that he who seeks shall find, and that if he knocks it shall be opened to him. Who, then, is prepared to prove that a single adult person, since St. Paul (Rom. x.) declared the Gospel had been preached in all the earth, has ever died out of the Church, who could never, if he had made a proper use of the means placed within his reach, have found his way into her communion ? Can they who urge the objection in any possible way whatever prove this ? How can they say that even the ordinary missionary has ever failed the ready mind and the willing heart ? Known unto God are all hearts from eternity ; all things are at his disposal, and it can cost him nothing so to order it, that, wherever there is one ready and willing to receive the truth, there the missionary shall be present to teach him, and to introduce him into the communion of the Church. How know you that he does *not* so order it, and that, if any have died without actually having heard of the Church, it has been their own fault, — that is, because they would have rejected her in case she had been presented to them ? Till you can assert the contrary with infallible certainty, your objection has no validity ; for the difficulty it suggests is con-

fessedly restricted to those who are ready and willing to receive the truth as soon as proposed to them.

But let this pass. The dogma in question certainly can in no sense impeach the justice of God, if it asserts the condemnation of none who have fulfilled the law of nature. Men are not entitled to salvation even for fulfilling that law ; but they may certainly be justly condemned, if they do not fulfil it. Suppose, then, as the objection itself supposes, that, in the gentile world, there are persons, or may be persons, who, concurring with the graces they receive, fulfil the natural law : what obliges us to suppose that they must die out of the communion of the Church, even if it be conceded that they have no *ordinary* means of entering it ? God may, if he chooses, use *extraordinary* means to bring them into the Church ; and it is far more reasonable to suppose that he will work fifty miracles to bring men into the *medium ordinarium*, if necessary, than it is to suppose, that, contrary to the whole economy of grace, he will save a single soul without it. We know that he has made use of extraordinary means to bring men into the Church, as in the case of Cornelius, and that of the eunuch, recorded in the Acts of the Apostles ; and, indeed, he has always used them in the conversion of nations ; for in no instance has a nation been converted, in which the ordinary means employed for its conversion were adequate to the end. Why may he not use extraordinary means in the case of individuals, as well as of nations ?

Again ; in asserting that no one can be saved out of the Church, we do not assert that all those who die out of her communion will be condemned precisely for the guilt of not being in her communion. Invincible ignorance, unquestionably, excuses from sin in that whereof one is invincibly ignorant. If there are persons out of the Church invincibly ignorant of her, — that is, persons who never have had the power of becoming acquainted with her, and of being joined to her communion, — they certainly are not guilty of the sin of infidelity, and cannot be condemned for that sin. But invincible ignorance, though it excuses from sin, has no saving efficacy, no positive power to advance the soul towards the kingdom of heaven. Certainly, mere negative infidels, as they are called, are excused from the sin of infidelity ; yet, without conversion, they cannot be saved, “ for without faith it is impossible to please God.” Heb. xi. 6. Hence St. Thomas says, — “ Infidels of this sort are damned, not, indeed, for the sin of infidelity, but for other sins, not remissible without faith.” Infidelity is not the only sin for

which men are damned ; if it were, we should be obliged to assert, that all bad as well as all good Catholics will be saved ; nor is it necessarily, by any means, the only sin of those not in the Catholic communion. The condemnation of these will not be for the sin of infidelity, if they are not guilty of it, but for their other sins. They will be condemned, not by reason of the guilt, but by reason of the fact, of being out of the Church, for their sins against the natural law, which are remissible only through the Church.

Finally, we are told that there are persons out of the Church who are not only free from the sin of infidelity, but from all actual sin. But this is a gratuitous assumption ; for, without a special revelation from God, we cannot know that there are such persons, and nothing, so far as we are aware, either in reason or sound theology, authorizes us to assume that there are or can be. But suppose there can be, and that there are, such persons, nothing obliges us to assert, or permits you to assume that we assert, their condemnation to the *tortures* of hell. The Catholic dogma objected to simply teaches, that no one can ever be saved out of the Catholic Church, that is, enter into eternal life,—see God in the beatific vision by the light of glory. What the dogma obliges us to assert is, that salvation, in this sense, which is supernatural both in its principle and its terminus, is unattainable out of the Church. But this salvation does not necessarily stand opposed simply to the torments of hell. Hell is twofold, and consists in the punishment of loss and the punishment of sense. None are saved who do not escape both ; but not therefore does it necessarily follow, that all who are not saved are doomed to suffer both. All are guilty of original sin, and original sin itself forfeits heaven, and incurs the punishment of loss ; but the Church does not teach that it incurs also the punishment of sense. Hence unbaptized infants, who die before committing actual sin,—though they lose heaven, can never see God by the light of glory,—do not, as our theologians teach, suffer the punishment of sense, do not, as we are permitted to hope, suffer positive pain, but will be gainers by having existed. Not of them, but of actual sinners who die in their sins, is it to be said, “ Good for them if they had never been born.”

Suppose now,—and if the supposition is inadmissible the objection vanishes,—that among the gentiles there are persons who die out of the Church, free from all actual sin : they, certainly, will never see God, will never enter heaven, will not be saved ; yet nothing obliges us to believe that they will be doomed to

the punishment of sense, or to the positive sufferings of hell. What will be their fate, beyond the fact that they will not be saved, we do not know, and do not attempt to determine. We remit them, if such there are, to the bounty of God, who, for aught we know, may place them in the category of unbaptized infants who die in their infancy. But no injustice is done them in not admitting them to the beatific vision ; for to see God by the light of glory is a *gratuitous* reward, promised only to supernatural faith and sanctity, never due and never promised to mere natural innocence or to mere natural virtue. The defect of natural innocence or of natural virtue excludes from it, but the possession of either or of both does not and cannot entitle to it ; and natural innocence and virtue are all that it can be pretended that these have. Hence, supposing such persons, supposing them to die free from all but original sin, no injustice is done them in excluding them from salvation, and therefore the dogma which denies the possibility of salvation out of the Church asserts nothing contrary to the justice or even to the fidelity of God.

But granting all this as far as regards Jews, Mahometans, and pagans, that is, unbaptized persons, it cannot apply, we are told, to persons in heretical communions, who are invincibly ignorant ; for these are baptized, and in their baptism have received the infused grace of faith and sanctification. But the reasoning we have used to show that it is not proved, and is not to be assumed without proof, that there are any who die without ever having had the power, if they had made the proper use of the means within their reach, of being joined to the Catholic communion, applies here in its greatest force, and renders an answer really unnecessary. The possibility of invincible ignorance, in an heretical communion, of the Catholic Church, — since the Catholic Church is always included in the formal reason of faith in those very articles which all admit are necessary, *necessitate medii ad salutem*, — may well be questioned, and is not to be presumed, especially since those of whom you would predicate it have received in their baptism the habit of faith which is a predisposition to believe, and a supernatural facility in believing, the truth. But let this pass. Suppose invincible ignorance in the case to be possible, and that there are persons baptized in heretical communions, who die invincibly ignorant of the Catholic Church, we grant that they are excused from the sin of heresy. If they have been sinners, they will be damned for their sins ; if they have retain-

ed their baptismal innocence, — an improbable supposition, — or if they make an act of perfect contrition and die free from mortal sin, — another improbable supposition, — they will undoubtedly be saved ; but not as members of heretical communions, but as members of the Catholic Church, to whose communion they were joined by baptism. Consequently, the admission of their salvation forms no exception to the dogma, that out of the Church no one can ever be saved. These, therefore, present no difficulty. But we may remark, by the way, that none, whether among the schismatical, the heretical, or the unbaptized, who are aware of the dogma of the Church and the explanations which Catholic theologians give of it, can be invincibly ignorant. They, whatever must be said of others, have had the opportunity of hearing the Church, and their ignorance is vincible, culpable in its cause, and can no longer excuse from sin. Whatever their characters in other respects, they may, therefore, be justly condemned for the single sin of infidelity, heresy, or schism, as the case may be.

We may say, in brief, that we are obliged, by the Catholic dogma of exclusive salvation, to divide all mankind, in the first instance, into two classes, — namely, Catholics and non-Catholics. Salvation is predicable only of Catholics, because they only are where there are the means of salvation ; it is to be denied of all not Catholics, or who die in the second division, for they are out of the Church, and at least under the penalty of original sin, and there is no remission of sin out of the Church. This is all that the dogma of exclusive salvation imports.

In the second instance, in regard to those who will be condemned to hell, including both the punishment of loss and the punishment of sense, we recognize four classes. 1. All who die bad Catholics. These will be damned for their sins and their abuse of the graces and privileges which have been extended to them. 2. All who have impugned the known truth, that is, persons who have actually known the Catholic Church and faith, but have rejected or refused to believe her, and died in their sin. These are formal heretics, schismatics, or infidels, and will be damned, if for no other sin, for their infidelity, heresy, or schism. 3. All who might have known the truth, if they had sought it, but did not seek it, — that is, persons who, though they have never actually known the Church, yet have had the opportunity of knowing her, and of becoming joined to her communion, and have neglected to avail themselves of it.

These are, by implication, infidels, or heretics, and will be damned for the sin of having neglected to become Catholics when they might. 4. All who, though they may never actually have had an opportunity of becoming Catholics, have nevertheless sinned against the law of nature. These will be damned, not for the guilt of not being in the Catholic Church, but for their failure to keep the natural law. On the supposition of the truth of the Catholic Church, there is nothing contrary to the justice of God in the damnation of these four classes.

In the third instance, you tell us that there is yet another class, not included in the first general division, nor yet in any one of these four special divisions, — namely, a class invincibly ignorant of the Church, yet innocent of all sin against the natural law, the only law by which they can be judged. But you do not and cannot prove the existence of such a class ; you have no authority for alleging that there is or can be such a class, and we are unable to reconcile its existence with the publicity of the Catholic Church, the ease with which she may be distinguished, the well-known fact that sufficient grace is given unto every man, and that Christ is always, along with the Church, operating by his grace to bring all men to her communion, as well as to save them in her communion after they have entered it. But, if there be such a class, they cannot be saved ; for they are out of the Church, — have by original sin incurred the forfeiture of heaven ; and there is no remission of sin but through the Church. But, as God was not obliged in justice to bring them into the Church, he does them no injustice in not admitting them to the beatific vision, — the only punishment to which we are obliged by faith to hold that they are doomed.

Thus much we have thought it not improper to remark on the first branch of our subject, that no false inferences may be drawn from the fact that Catholic writers, as well as others, contend for the political toleration of the various sects. We assert rigid intolerance of all false religions, in the spiritual order ; but it must not, therefore, be supposed that we deny, or do not assert, the legitimacy of their toleration in the political order. It is true, as we have said, that, in speaking of toleration, we exclude our Church ; for there can never be rightfully any question at all, whether she shall be free or not. She is God's Church, and is free by Divine right, not by the concession of the prince or the commonwealth. As much, we

concede, we do not and cannot say for the sects. They are contrary to the will of God, forbidden by his law, and have no Divine right to be at all. But not therefore does it follow that the civil authority is bound to suppress them, or is not bound even to tolerate them. The state — and we beg that the fact be borne in mind — is not commissioned to execute the *whole* law of God ; and, though it can never rightfully do anything contrary to that law, it has authority to enforce it only in externals, and even in externals only so far as necessary to the maintenance of the peace and welfare of society. There are mortal sins against the law of God, of daily and hourly occurrence, that transcend the reach of the civil magistrate, and which he has no right to punish. We may transgress against God in thought as well as in deed ; but the state must leave our punishment to Him who has said, “ Vengeance is mine, and I will repay,” — save when our sinful thoughts break out in deeds contrary to the rights of our neighbour or the real interests of civil society. Till then, our offences pertain to the spiritual order, and do not fall under the cognizance of the civil magistrate, who has no competency in spirituals. There are also virtues, — such as faith, hope, charity, meekness, gentleness, humility, benevolence, — all strictly obligatory upon all men, which the civil authority cannot enforce, and has no right to enforce ; for, though of the last importance to the peace and safety of society, they lie, as to their principle and motive, wholly within the spiritual order. Everybody knows this, and nobody, to our knowledge, directly contradicts it. It does not, then, follow, from the exclusiveness of religion in her own order, that the political order must always enforce the same exclusiveness, and suppress whatever is opposed to it.

All must agree that the state has no right to establish a false religion, or to prohibit the true religion ; because every man has from Almighty God himself full and entire freedom to profess the true religion, and no one can, under any circumstances whatever, be bound to profess or adhere, even externally, to a false religion. To profess the true religion is the duty of all men, and no government has or can have the right to hinder its subjects from performing their duty. Hence Protestant, schismatic, and infidel governments are justly accused of transcending their powers, exceeding their commission, and violating the first principles of religion ; for, with the exception of our own, which acknowledges its own incompetency in spirituals, there is not one of them that has not prohib-

ited, or that even now more than barely tolerates, the Catholic religion. Every state in Europe, not professedly Catholic, establishes by law even now a false religion, and in several of them the true religion is strictly prohibited, or not tolerated at all. Sweden and Denmark establish Lutheranism, deny all civil rights to Catholics, and forbid their subjects, under severe penalties, to unite themselves with the Catholic Church. In Russia, no man is allowed to leave the national church for ours; in Prussia, conversions from Protestantism to Catholicity, and efforts on the part of Catholics to effect them, are, or recently were, forbidden by law; and it is only two or three years since the Norwegian Storting first granted a partial toleration to the Catholic religion in Norway. It is still, we believe, proscribed by law in Holland, and has owed a precarious freedom, for some years past, chiefly to the connivance of the prince. In Switzerland, it is now suffering a cruel persecution from the government, and her noble prelate, the Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, has recently been imprisoned, and is now in exile, simply for discharging his episcopal functions. We need not mention the well-known penal laws of England and Ireland, partially repealed in 1829, but still leaving the profession of the Catholic religion subject to many restrictions and vexations. By these laws, it was death for a priest to say mass in England, or to receive a member of the Establishment into his Church. Indeed, it is well known that Protestantism and infidelity, wherever able, have never failed to copy the example of pagan Rome, to place an interdict on the Catholic religion, and to enjoin, and to seek by pains and penalties to enforce, a false religion, or the profession of no religion. But all governmental acts of this sort are violences rather than laws, and have and can have no binding force. We are always bound to resist them, at least passively; for we must obey God rather than men; and there are times when charity to our neighbour may require us to resist them even actively.

But, though the state has no right to enjoin the profession of a false religion, or to prohibit the profession of the true religion, yet, is it not bound, we may be asked, to enjoin the profession of the true religion, and to prohibit that of the false? It certainly would be, if it were commissioned to promulgate and execute the *whole* law of God, and if there were nothing in religion left to conscience and free will. But the latter, we know, is not true; for even the canon law strikes only external actions, and the Church judges matters of conscience only in her tribu-

nals of penance, approach to which is and must be an act of free will, and before which the culprit is his only and his voluntary accuser ; and the former cannot be assumed, for that would make the state the church, and render all distinction between the secular society and the spiritual inconceivable. It would be the absorption of the church in the state, than which nothing is more to be dreaded, as the history of Russia since Ivan the Fourth, and of England since Henry the Eighth, abundantly testifies. The state has civil, but no spiritual, functions ; it is not in Holy Orders ; it has not received the mission of evangelizing the world ; and it has no vocation to preach the Gospel, or to assume the direction of consciences. It is certainly bound to recognize and protect the full and entire freedom of the true religion, and to suppress by force, if necessary, all external violence against it ; for this is included in the civil rights of those who profess it ; but it can legitimately use coercion, either in favor of the true or against a false religion, only for purely social reasons, and only so far as necessary to the maintenance of the order and interests of society ; for, as we never cease to repeat, its functions are purely civil, and it has no spiritual competency.

Certainly the obligation or right of civil governments, not Catholic, — where there is no publicly recognized infallible spiritual authority to determine which is the true religion, — to enjoin the profession of the true worship, and to prohibit others, cannot be asserted ; because the government, having only civil functions, cannot judge in spirituals, or discriminate between one religion and another. It cannot, then, enjoin one worship or prohibit another, for fear, if for no other reason, that it may enjoin a false religion and proscribe the true ; and therefore it must, even in common prudence, tolerate all religions not obviously immoral, like the obscene and cruel rites of many pagan nations, or directly incompatible with the safety and welfare of society. This binds all governments not Catholic to universal toleration, because all religions but the Catholic are confessedly fallible, and can, on their own showing, offer the government no infallible judgment by which it may form, or to which it is bound to submit, its own.

With regard to Catholic governments, or governments of Catholic countries, where there is an infallible spiritual authority publicly recognized by the nation, we distinguish between those governments which have only the ordinary obligations of civil government and those governments which hold from the

Church, or under the express condition of professing and defending the Catholic religion. Governments of the first-mentioned class are bound to acknowledge the true religion, and to throw their *moral* influence into its scale; for the state, as well as the individual, is bound to have a conscience, and even a good conscience; but nothing in the constitution of the state binds these governments to enforce the profession of the Catholic religion, or to prohibit that of other religions; and as these religions, if not palpably immoral, are not, in themselves, social offences, the government has no right to declare them so, or to suppress them. These governments, having by their constitution only the ordinary functions of civil governments, can do no more for the true religion or against false religions than the interests of society demand; and as such governments themselves presuppose a state of society in which false religions, as such, are not incompatible with these interests, they are bound to tolerate them, and leave their suppression to the operation of moral causes.

As to the second class of Catholic governments distinguished, that they are bound to recognize the Catholic religion as the law of the land, and are not free to tolerate all religions, we grant. But there are few, if any, such governments now in existence; and the reasons which formerly demanded and justified them have, in the social changes which have taken place in recent times, lost their force, and cannot now be urged for the establishment or the maintenance of similar governments. In the Middle Ages, nearly all the European governments not pagan were professedly Catholic, and did and had the right to punish open infidelity, heresy, and schism, — always sins against God, — because then they were directly crimes against society, forbidden by the public law; and crimes against society the civil government has always the right to punish. But now, when that political order has passed away, and, in the altered circumstances of our times, these sins against God are no longer to be treated as direct crimes against society, the government is not bound, and has no right, to punish them; because civil government has never the right, we repeat, to punish any sin, except for the reason that it is a social offence, which society cannot, with a just regard to its own safety, suffer to go unpunished.

We do not assume that infidelity, heresy, and schism were social offences, merely because they were declared such by the laws, or made such by the fundamental constitution of the

state. The laws, as in pagan Rome, or in England before Catholic emancipation, may establish a false religion and prohibit the true ; but that does not make the profession of the true religion a social crime, or incompatible with the legitimate interests of society. If religion and the laws come in conflict, it is the laws that are to be reformed, not the religion that is to be suppressed. To say otherwise, — to say that false religions are justly punishable by civil society, simply because contrary to the civil law, — would be to concede that the profession of the true religion may be justly punished in those states in which the civil law prohibits it. The laws must themselves be just, or they do not bind ; and the fundamental constitution of a state must be legitimate, or a measure is not justifiable simply because authorized by it or necessary to preserve it. What we assert is, that the political order, which, in former times, declared infidelity, heresy, and schism, when breaking out into overt acts, social offences, was itself just ; because then they were such offences in fact as well as in law, and the laws only declared a truth which existed independently of them. The intolerance of the government was justifiable, because demanded by its fundamental and essential constitution, and that constitution was itself justifiable by its absolute necessity, under the circumstances, to the existence of society and the interests of civilization.

In the barbaric ages which followed the destruction of the Western Roman Empire, — ages against which we hear so many noisy and senseless declamations, and in which we ourselves find little, except Catholicity and what proceeded from it, which does not revolt us, — the Church of God had a double mission to perform, and was obliged to add to her spiritual functions the greater part of the functions of civil society itself. She was the sole repository of what had been saved from the wrecks of the old Roman civilization, and the only civilizing force that remained after the barbarian irruption and devastations. The lay society was dissolved by the ruin of the empire and of the civilized populations, and was no longer adequate to the management of secular affairs in accordance with civilized order. The Church was obliged to add to her mission of evangelizer, which is her mission of all times and places, the temporary and accidental mission of civilizer, of the nations. She must tame the wild savage, humanize the ruthless barbarian, reestablish social order, revive science and the arts, and restore and advance civilization. All had been de-

molished, and she had all to reconstruct. She had to be statesman, lawyer, physician, pedagogue, architect, painter, sculptor, musician, agriculturist, horticulturist, bookbinder, and common mechanic or artisan, — in fine, everything but money-changer and soldier. Having thus the chief part of the work of civil society to perform, it became absolutely necessary that she should have a civil and political existence and authority, — that she should be incorporated into the state, as an integral element of the civil constitution, and have her worship, without which she could have as little social as religious influence, recognized as the law of the land as well as the law of God. There was no other condition of rescuing society from the chaos and barbarism in which it was plunged, and of reviving civilization and securing its progress. Infidelity, heresy, and schism, which were as directly in opposition to her mission of civilizing the nations as to her mission of evangelizing them, were then directly and proximately crimes against society, and as such were justly punishable by the public authorities. In attacking the Church, they attacked civil society itself, struck at the very conditions of social order, and jeopardized every social interest.

But, from the nature of the case, this mission of civilizer of nations is restricted to barbarous ages and countries, for the very good reason that the Church cannot be called upon to civilize nations when they are already civilized. This mission she has now, in great measure, accomplished in what is called Christendom ; and the necessity of that particular political order which specially protected her in its performance, or which was requisite to enable her to perform it, does not now exist. The lay society she has rescued from barbarism, and civilized. It has now the arts of civilized life in its own possession, and does not need, as it once did, in barbarous ages, the Church to teach it how to make shoes, bind books, or brew hop-beer. It is now competent, under the *spiritual* direction of the spiritual society, to the management of secular affairs. It has, in these affairs, which properly belong to it, attained to majority, and no longer needs in regard to them, so far as purely secular and as they involve no moral principle, to be under ecclesiastical tutelage. The Church is now free to resign her temporary civil functions, and to devote herself exclusively to the mission of evangelizing the world. It is not necessary that she should be now incorporated into the state, in the sense she was in the barbaric ages ; and consequently infidelity, heresy, and schism, though as great sins against God as ever, are not now crimes

against society in the sense they then were, or to be punished as such ; and therefore, as long as their adherents demean themselves peaceably, offer no external violence to the true religion, and discharge their ordinary social obligations, they are to be politically tolerated, and left to answer for their sinfulness, great as it unquestionably is, to God himself.

This reasoning cannot well be disputed. When infidelity, heresy, and schism, as well as any other sins against God, are clearly and directly crimes against society, they are justly punishable by the civil authorities ; but when they only remotely offend against social interests, and are chiefly censurable only as they injure the soul, they are not so punishable, and the prince or commonwealth is bound to tolerate them. This is the principle we lay down. In former times, they were obviously and directly crimes against society, and as such were justly punishable by the civil magistrate ; but, owing to the civilization effected by the social labors of the Church, they are not now such crimes, and therefore not now punishable as such, but are to be politically tolerated, for they now can be, without directly or immediately endangering the existence of social order, or sacrificing the general interests of civilization. Here are the facts we assert.

All this is virtually conceded by all the respectable publicists of our times. No intelligent Protestant or infidel really denies — though we know not how long it will be so — the immense services rendered to civilization by the Catholic Church, and with one voice all those who give us philosophies of history, from Guizot to our Kentucky friend, J. D. Nourse, agree that she could not have rendered those services without the civil constitution which made hostility to her faith, discipline, or worship social offences. The present popular theory of those who are not Catholics is, that the Church was the true Church, and faithfully and successfully performed her mission, down to the epoch of the Protestant Reformation, and that she is a false Church now, because now she leaves the interests of civilization to the lay society, and does not exert herself directly to promote them, which, according to them, she is bound to do, since, say they, her mission is merely that of civilizing mankind. We are aware of no intelligent voice, in even the uncatholic world, that does not defend the mutual relations of the civil and ecclesiastical societies which obtained in the barbarous ages as wise and necessary for those times, or that pretends to

- condemn them, except when insisted upon as equally necessary

or proper in the altered state of modern civilization. Here is all we ask. Restricted to the temporary and accidental mission of the Church as civilizer, we recognize a truth in what our popular authors advance. They say the political order in question was just and necessary during the barbarous ages : so say we. They say it is not just now : so say we ; and therefore we, as well as they, reject it for our times. Because the Church approved it in one set of circumstances, we are not obliged to maintain that she must approve it under every set of circumstances. Principles are immutable and eternal, but their application must vary according to the circumstances of time and place. This the popular authors themselves contend, and this is all we allege ; and we have no quarrel with them, except when they assert that the mission of the Church is primarily and exclusively that of civilizer, and contend that she is false or dead now, because she does not now labor directly for the advancement of civilization, which, we need hardly say, is as silly as it is untrue.

It is evident from what we have said, that, though we assert the most rigid theological intolerance, and the wisdom and justice of the political intolerance which nobody denies was during many centuries asserted, and sometimes practised, by Catholic states, we are bound by Catholic principles to assert for our times the toleration of all religions compatible with the existence and interests of society.

We do not, our readers will observe, justify the political intolerance in question, on the ground that it was sanctioned by the public opinion of former times, nor do we defend the political toleration of false religions now, because public opinion now demands it. Public opinion may often be pleaded in excuse or in extenuation of the conduct of individuals, but it is never to be appealed to as the standard of right and wrong, especially when the question turns on principles and institutions either sanctioned or not disavowed by an infallible Church. Not the public opinion, but the public necessities, the interests of society, of civilization, justified the political intolerance ; and these would, if they existed, justify it now as well as then, — and not only justify it, but even demand it. Let the modern political and social order be broken up, the civilization which Christian nations have, by painful toil and sacrifice for so many ages, slowly worked out, be swept away, the whole of Christendom overrun with hordes of ruthless and lawless barbarians, and the world be plunged once more into •

the darkness and chaos of barbarism, — and let the Church remain the sole repository of what has been retained of the former civilization, the only living social organism, the only living organic force, able to reduce chaos to order, to restore society to its normal condition, to reproduce and provide for the advance of civilization, — and we would say at once, Revive the former political and social constitution ; incorporate the Church again into the state ; let her resume anew her functions as civilizer, as well as evangelizer, of the nations ; let her faith, discipline, and worship, without which she can have no social influence even, be made the law of the land, and whatever is repugnant to them be declared a crime against society, and, when manifesting itself in overt acts, punishable as such by the civil magistrate ; — and we should have little respect for the head, little reverence for the heart, that could not or would not say as much. But now, we repeat, when such is not the state of things, and, until some terrible calamity not now foreseen, and in all human probability not likely to occur, shall throw society out of its normal order, and bring it back, we say, Let the Church be the Church, and the state be the state, the two orders be distinct, and the lay society, under the *spiritual* direction of the spiritual society, manage the temporal affairs of the world, as now, thanks to the Church, which did not fail it in time of need, it is able to do ; let the public law, where it is proper, recognize the true religion, but let it punish no sins against God any farther than they are directly and immediately crimes against society. False religions are, no doubt, always offences against society, as are all sins against God ; but, as we have said more than once, when and where they are only remotely and indirectly so, when and where they are not directly and immediately so, the civil law has no right by coercive means to repress them, and could not do so if it should make the attempt. Their adherents, in all other respects discharging their social duties and demeaning themselves as good citizens, must be protected in their civil rights, and their punishment be remitted to the discipline of the spiritual society and the justice of God.

The Church cannot tolerate the punishment, by the civil authority, of offences purely spiritual, because the civil authority cannot do it without trenching upon her province. She allows no one to be molested merely for his want of faith, because, for his want of faith, the unbeliever is answerable to God alone. Faith is voluntary, and cannot be forced. Who-

ever chooses to run the risk of the penalty of eternal damnation annexed to infidelity is free to be an infidel, and Almighty God neither does violence, nor suffers any power on earth to do violence, to his free will. He proffers eternal life to all men, tells them the conditions on which they may receive it, gives them the necessary graces to accept and secure it, urges them by the most powerful motives which can be addressed to reason, conscience, free will ; but he forces no one to accept it. He demands the heart, its free, voluntary obedience, and will accept and reward only the free-will offering. Hence the Church strictly and solemnly forbids any one to be forced or compelled to receive the faith. Hence her missionaries are never armed soldiers, but humble preachers, bearing only the crucifix and pastoral staff. Never has she allowed the unbaptized — Jews, pagans, Mahometans, infidels — to be forced to profess the Catholic faith, or force to be employed against them, except to compel them to tolerate the preaching of the Gospel. If in Catholic states they have ever been disturbed or molested on account of their unbelief, it has been against her authority, or because they practised violence against the profession of the true religion ; or because they were dangerous subjects to the state, and could not, under the circumstances, be safely tolerated, — as, for instance, in Spain under Charles the Fifth, when the Jews and Moors conspired in secret and with the enemies of the Church, not simply to secure the peaceable enjoyment of their own religions, but to overthrow both altar and throne, both of which the state had the right, and was bound, to protect and defend, to the full extent of its power, against any and every class of enemies.

The Church certainly claims authority over all baptized persons, by whomsoever they may have been baptized ; for they are, in the Sacrament of Baptism, born her subjects, and she has a right to their obedience. Heretics and schismatics are her rebellious subjects, and she has the same right to reduce them to obedience, and to compel them to conform their life to their baptismal vows, that a temporal sovereign has to reduce a rebellious province to submission to his legitimate authority. But she can reduce them only by such means as she possesses, and can inflict on them for their rebellion only such punishments as she has at her command, which are all spiritual. If they make war on her, and attempt to seize her churches, to rob her of her possessions, to desecrate her

altars, and to suppress her worship or restrain its freedom, as was the case with the early Protestants in every country where they had power enough, and which caused the terrible religious wars of the sixteenth century, and the persecution of Protestants by Catholic princes, she has the right to call in the secular power to her aid, and it is bound to repel them by force ; because they themselves then transfer the controversy from the spiritual order to the temporal, and attack the social and civil rights of the Church no less than her spiritual rights. But when they themselves restrain their heresy and schism within the limits of the spiritual order, make no attempt to propagate their pestilential errors or iniquity by violence, and attack none of the rights of the Church or of the faithful, she, as we have seen, recognizes no right in the secular authority to molest them, unless guilty of other crimes against society, — and then only on principles which apply equally to all classes of social offenders. As simple heresy and schism, she cannot call in the secular authority to aid her in suppressing them. She is therefore reduced to her own spiritual resources, to addresses to their reason and their conscience, and can inflict on them only spiritual punishments, ecclesiastical censures, of which the greatest is excommunication. This, to a believer, is a terrible punishment, we grant ; but to those who do not believe, who excommunicate themselves, and glory in being severed from her communion, it is not a punishment too severe to be borne.

But even in inflicting her spiritual censures, and in all her dealings with her rebellious subjects, the Church always has their reformation at heart, and never forgets that her mission is to save men's souls, and not to destroy them. She pleads with them, and leaves no measure untried that is likely to be successful ; and she keeps the door always open for the return of the penitent. When she is under the painful necessity of delivering over to Satan those who set at naught her discipline, it is for "the destruction of the flesh," that "they may learn not to blaspheme." To the very last, she pleads with all a mother's sweetness, affection, and grief ; and if they are finally melted, and willing to return to their duty, she opens wide her arms, and wide her heart, to receive them, and generously forgets their past disobedience. Even the much decried and calumniated Inquisition, which it is possible politicians in some instances have abused, owed its origin to her

maternal solicitude, and was instituted no less for the protection than for the detection of the misbelieving. She would interpose the shield of her maternal love between her rebellious subject and the secular arm to the last, till all hope was gone, till all her resources to reclaim him were exhausted. They know little of the Church of God who call her cruel, proud, haughty, revengeful, thirsting for the blood of heretics, and rejoicing in their punishment by the civil authority. Long, long does she forbear with them, — long, long does she suffer them to rend her own bosom, — before she can endure to withdraw her affectionate embrace, and abandon them to their self-chosen doom.

And here we are admonished of what should be the spirit of our intercourse with our unbelieving and heretical neighbours and fellow-citizens. Rousseau asserts that the dogma, Out of the Church there is no salvation, is antisocial, and that whoever professes it should be banished from the commonwealth. But he might as well have said, that the dogma, No one who dies guilty of mortal sin can be saved, is antisocial, and he who holds it should be banished from society. We certainly regard infidels and heretics as guilty of mortal sin before God, and therefore, if dying in their infidelity and heresy, as condemned to hell. But they are not the only persons whom we regard as mortal sinners ; and all who die mortal sinners, even though they should die nominally in our own communion, must, according to our faith, receive the same doom. There are persons in the Church who will talk, write, fight for their religion, do anything for it but live it, whose doom will be far more severe than that of many heretics and unbelievers ; nay, we know not but we ourselves may be of the number, for no man knoweth whether he deserves love or hatred, unless he has received a special revelation from God. We live in a world of sinners, and there may be in our own families, in our bosom companions, sinners for whose salvation we have as little reason to hope as we have for that of the unbeliever or the heretic. These things are so, and must be so, and our rule of conduct is and should be the same towards sinners of all classes, that is, to conduct ourselves so as, if possible, to win them all to the love and practice of true religion.

It is very true that all who are not joined to the Catholic communion, if they die as they are, will come short of salvation. This we know by infallible faith ; but we do not know that

all who are not now joined to that communion will die as they are, and have no right to presume that they will. Nothing assures us that their hearts will not be softened, their pride subdued, their eyes opened, — that they will not one day behold, love, and conform to the truth, and enter into the kingdom of heaven, while, perhaps, we ourselves shall be thrust out into exterior darkness, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. It is no less an error to hold that all out of the Church will be damned, than it is to hold that they can be saved without being in the Church. If we so held, there would be some foundation for Rousseau's charge ; our doctrine would be antisocial, and we should be unable to discharge our social duties towards those out of our Church. But we hold no such doctrine. There is a place of repentance for them as well as for us, and nothing forbids us to hope and to labor for their salvation. The Lord alone knoweth who are his, and we have no right to presume, as long as there is life, that the doom of any one is sealed. We must, then, treat all men, those without as well as those within, as persons for whom Christ died, as persons who may be saved, and whose salvation is to be desired by us with an unbounded charity, and for which we are to rejoice to make any sacrifice in our power. Here is the reason why the dogma objected to is not antisocial, and why to profess it is no breach of charity to our neighbour, but, if done in the proper spirit, is the very reverse, — is, in fact, the highest evidence we can give of the truth and fervor of our charity.

The object of the Church, in all her dealings with those without, as well as with those within, is the salvation of souls. This must be ours, also, as her faithful children. This object we shall be able to further only as we live in accordance with the spirit of our religion. It requires no deep or extensive knowledge of mankind to know that the road to their convictions lies through their affections. If we would be instrumental, under God, in converting them, we must begin by loving them, and by our love winning their love. Nothing is gained by convincing a man against his will ; often the very logic that convinces, where the affections are not won, serves only to repel from obedience to the truth. We succeed in influencing others for their good only in proportion as we set before them an example fit for them to follow, — are meek, gentle, humble, charitable, kind, and affectionate in our intercourse with them. And why shall we not love these

neighbours and countrymen of ours, who have not the inconceivable happiness of being in the Church of God? Who are we, that we should set up ourselves above them, — that we should boast over them? What merit is it in us, that we are not even as they? or how know we that ours will not be the greater condemnation? Are they not our kinsmen according to the flesh? Has not our God loved them with an infinite tenderness? Does he not proffer them his love with infinite sweetness? And has he not so longed for their love that he has died to win it? How, then, shall we not love them and labor for their salvation with a charity that burns with an intensity proportioned to their danger? Is it not here where we come short? Repelled by the bigotry, fanaticism, and hard-heartedness of some, attracted by the sweetness, affection, and kind offices of others, are we not prone to look upon these countrymen of ours who are out of the Church, either as persons whose conversion is hopeless, or as persons who need no conversion; — excusing ourselves from zealous labors to bring them to God by persuading ourselves that their conversion either is not possible or not necessary, — forgetful that in either case we sin against faith and charity, and in both show ourselves wanting in true love of our neighbour, and therefore of God? Is not here, in this double error, the reason why so few, comparatively, of our countrymen are brought into the one fold, under the One Shepherd?

There is nothing in modern heresies that should discourage us. The world, before this, has been afflicted with as deep, as wide-spread, and as obstinate heresies as it is now. We must not suppose that we have fallen upon peculiarly evil times. Evils, indeed, there are, but our lot is cast in comparatively good times. What is the situation of Catholics now in comparison with what it was under the Arian successors of Constantine? or when the wild and destructive hordes of Northern barbarians overwhelmed the Western Empire? or when the yet more destructive Saracenic hosts, with the Koran in one hand and the scymitar in the other, shouting “There is one God and Mohammed is his prophet,” overran the East, and, over more than half the known world, over the fairest provinces of even Europe herself, supplanted the Cross by the Crescent? But Arianism has been subdued, and is remembered only in the immortal records of its victors; the barbarians have been civilized; the Saracenic hosts have been checked, their power has been broken, and their once

formidable empire retains a fitful existence only by the iniquitous policy of nominally Christian princes, who forget their God and the interests of civilization in a vain endeavour to maintain an ever-varying balance of power, and to arrest the march of Destiny. Better the Russian than the Turk at Constantinople. Protestantism itself, which swept away a third part of Europe, as the tail of the Apocalyptic dragon swept away a third part of the stars of heaven, has spent its force, has been driven back far within its original confines, and, for two hundred and fifty years, has made no progress in the Old World, but towards destruction. True, Unbelief, Indifference, Socialism, Communism, Revolutionism, are, or just now were, rife ; — true, they held during the last year their carnival, convulsed the greater part of Europe, exiled the Sovereign Pontiff, took possession of the Eternal City, and for a moment seemed on the point of rising to empire. But defeat follows on the heels of victory, their chiefs have fallen, are in exile or in prison, and they must soon be objects of ridicule and contempt, rather than of fear and dread. They are, in the nature of things, short-lived. The human race loves order, and must be a believer. It must worship, — must have a religion ; and the Catholic religion alone has life, has energy, has power. Even to a superficial observer, all other religions or pretended religions are struck with death, and are in their agony. Appearances indicate that a glorious day is dawning for the Church, and that there awaits her a more splendid triumph than she has ever yet enjoyed. The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. Let us not feel that these unbelieving and misbelieving countrymen of ours — who now, alas ! have no hope but in this hollow and transitory life, who are laboring for that which is not bread, and spending their strength for that which satisfieth not — are all doomed to be lost, and that they of all the world are to have no part in the new triumphs reserved for Catholicity. Let us not feel that the time is never to come, when, for their many civic virtues and their generous contributions to an oppressed and famishing nation, they can receive no higher reward than the discovery of the gold mines of California. Let us not look upon their conversion even as difficult. They, too, are famishing, and for the bread of life. We have only to remember that this land is under the protection of the Immaculate Virgin, and to live as true children of Mary, in order to behold this noble country — whose destiny, if we are faithful, promises to surpass what the boldest imagination can conceive — won to the

Cross, and standing foremost among the Catholic nations of the earth.

But to return from this apparent digression, we will simply add, in conclusion, that, while we have asserted, as we were bound by reason and faith, the most rigid intolerance and exclusiveness in the religious order, and have justified the constitution and laws of Catholic states, during the Middle Ages, in declaring infidel, heretical, and schismatical sects social crimes, and punishing them as such, we have shown that, in a normal or civilized state of society, Catholicity is perfectly compatible with political toleration, and concedes at least as extensive toleration as is professed, and for the most part honorably maintained, by our American government. Our religion contains nothing, in case we should become the majority, and the political power should pass in this country into our hands, which would require any external changes in our existing political institutions, in our domestic and social economies, or in the present mutual relations of the civil and the ecclesiastical powers. In taking possession of a barbarous country, Catholicity must labor to change the institutions, the laws, the manners and customs, as well as the religion and interior sentiments, of the people. It has to do the same in taking possession even of a falsely civilized country, like India, China, or Japan. Catholicity can never tolerate the social institutions which are cherished by these Oriental nations, as the decisions of Rome, in the controversies between the Jesuits and Dominicans, fully prove. It can tolerate any form of government ; but it can, wherever it becomes resident, tolerate no despotism, no government that is not a government of law. The prince, whether monarch, aristocracy, or democracy, must govern according to law, and, as far as possible, according to just law ; for she recognizes no security for the worship of God where there is no protection for the rights of our neighbour, any more than she recognizes love to God where there is none to our brother. She can never tolerate the Oriental doctrine of castes, for she teaches that all men are of one blood, are brethren, equals before God, and should be equals before the law. The great reason why Christianity penetrates so slowly into these Oriental nations is, no doubt, the fact, that not their religion only, but their whole order of society, their whole political, social, and domestic life, is unchristian, and must be changed in order to make them Christian nations. A Chinese or a Hindoo might object, with truth, to the introduction of Chris-

tianity, that it would change his political and social institutions, as well as his religious beliefs and usages.

But when Catholicity took possession of the Roman empire, it changed nothing except the spiritual order, and what held from it. It stepped into the Roman civilization as if it had been expressly prepared for it, — as it no doubt, in a great measure, had been, — abolished the false gods, purged the temples of their idolatry, cleansed them with holy water, converted them into churches, and consecrated them to the true God, — changed the manners and customs of the people as far as they depended on the false religions which had been professed, but retained the social institutions, the schools, the academies, the laws, the whole exterior domestic and social economy as she found it, only infusing her own spirit into it, and animating it with a purer, a higher, and a more vigorous life. The same will be the case here. Our civilization is founded on a right basis, — is Roman and Christian in its groundwork ; and there never has been a state constituted throughout more in harmony with Catholic principles than the American. Its founders were not Catholics, — far from it ; but they would have been startled to have seen how much they were indebted to Catholicity for every important improvement they adopted. Their innovations were, for the most part, borrowed from Catholic teachers. Our American fathers had, unhappily for them, turned their backs upon the Church ; but they had been nursed in the bosom of her civilization. That civilization they brought with them to this New World, purged of the barbaric leaven which was still, in some measure, retained in the mother country, and against which the Popes and the whole spiritual society had protested for ten centuries. Whoever will examine the respective civil institutions of England and this country will hardly fail to perceive, that what of England we have rejected is what she owes to her barbarous ancestors, and what we have added which she has not has been borrowed from Roman and Catholic civilization. Indeed, just in proportion, under a civil and political point of view, as we have receded from England, we have approached Rome and Catholicity. They betray no little simplicity, and ignorance of modern civilization, who suppose that the triumph of Catholicity here would be the subversion of our political and civil constitution. Our institutions throughout are based upon the great principles of reason and common sense, which our Church presupposes and sanctions, inspired by Catholic tradition, and sustained by that portion of

Catholic life which the Protestant populations were able to carry with them when they broke away from its source, and which, we would fain hope, is not yet wholly extinct. Indeed, the body for Catholicity seems to us to be here already prepared. It is moulded from fine, rich, red earth, in a form of majestic proportions, and of surpassing beauty, wanting nothing but the Divine Breath to be breathed into its nostrils in order to become a living soul. The conversion of the country would destroy, would change, nothing in this admirable body, but it would quicken it with the breath of the Almighty, and secure its continuance, and its beneficent and successful operation.

We have not, we grant, defended the political toleration of different religions on infidel or even Protestant principles. It would have been idle to have done so ; for everybody knows that those principles are not ours, and cannot be, unless we give up our religion. We cannot place the sects on a footing of perfect equality with the Church, and defend their freedom on the same ground that we do hers ; because error can never exist by the same right that truth exists. The popular ground of defending the toleration of all religions by the state is the assumption of their equal right before God. This ground cannot be held by a Catholic ; and if we had assumed it, and on the strength of it asserted that Catholic states are bound to maintain universal toleration, who would have had any confidence in our sincerity, or not have supposed that our assertion was made merely for the purpose of escaping the odium of appearing to oppose the toleration by Catholic states of heretical or schismatical religions now, when toleration is popular, and we stand in need of it for ourselves ? Every intelligent Protestant or unbeliever, with the history of the Middle Ages before his eyes, would have said, “ Yes, these Catholics here in this country, where they are weak, are exceedingly liberal, and preach universal toleration ; but let them become strong, let them once get the political power, and we shall quickly see that they are as intolerant in the political order as they are confessedly in the spiritual order.” We Catholics must never forget that Protestants and unbelievers have a theory, to which they are wedded, that we are all ready to lie and swear to anything for the sake of Catholicity, and that we can go so far as to profess indifferentism, infidelity, or even Puritanism, if we think we can thereby promote the interests of our Church. Our assertions count for nothing with them. We are, in their estimation, fools when honest, and knaves when intelligent. Externally

considered, it is evidently for our interest, here in this country, and, indeed, in many other countries at the present time, to preach toleration ; and they suppose interest governs us, as it does them, and therefore they place no confidence in our preaching, unless we show clearly and undeniably that it is in harmony with the principles of our Church, where she is strong as well as where she is apparently weak.

We have therefore defended the political toleration of the sects as a Catholic statesman, on strictly Catholic principles, without the least compromise, — without descending for a moment from the high ground of the infallibility and immutability of our Church, — without blinking, or hesitating to justify in its fullest extent, the political intolerance manifested by Catholic states to infidelity, heresy, and schism in past times. We have shown that not mere policy, but the very principles of our holy religion, require us now — on the supposition that modern unbelievers, heretics, and schismatics are civilized, and no longer barbarians, or addicted to barbarous practices — to assert and maintain as broad a toleration as our American Constitution guaranties ; that they forbid the punishment by the civil authority of sins against God, however great, when not incompatible with the peace and welfare of society ; and that the Church can of herself inflict only spiritual punishments, and no greater spiritual punishment than excommunication. If this does not satisfy, it is not our fault, nor that of our Church.

ART. II. — *The Good and the Bad in the Roman Catholic Church. Is that Church to be Destroyed or Reformed?*
A Letter from Rome. By Rev. HENRY M. FIELD.
New York : G. P. Putnam. 1849. 12mo. pp. 34.

IF we have not mistaken him for another man, the writer of this Letter is a Calvinistic Congregational minister of our own neighbourhood, — a young man of fine abilities and generous feelings, respectable for his learning, and still more for his honest aims and strong religious tendencies. We cannot say that his pamphlet is highly creditable to him as a dialectician or as a theologian ; but it presents him in an amiable light as a man and as a philanthropist. It is not very consistent ; for it sets out with the assumption that our Church is a human institution,

then proceeds to prove it a true Christian Church, and closes by pointing out its supposed corruptions, and demanding its reformation. But if it is a human institution, it cannot be the Christian Church, nor a branch of it ; for the Christian Church is divine. If our Church is Christian, and actually doing the work of her Lord, as Mr. Field contends, it cannot be proper to judge her as a human institution, or to speak of "the good and the bad" in her ; and to propose the question whether she shall "be destroyed or reformed" is quite out of place. There is no little audacity in proposing to reform, there is something worse in proposing or in assuming it to be lawful to propose to destroy, the Church, or any portion of the Church, of Christ.

The author is aware that he may be charged with inconsistency, but he seeks to make it appear that the inconsistency is in his subject, not in himself. "I feel," he says (p. 3), "alternately admiration and disgust for the Roman Catholic Church. And if any man tells me that this is inconsistent, I answer that it is this very inconsistency which is alone consistent with truth. Human institutions are not wholly good, or wholly bad ; and he who praises or blames without discrimination is sure to be wrong." Very true of *human* institutions, which acknowledge themselves to be human ; and he who praises or blames *them* indiscriminately is sure to go wrong, we grant ; but this is not true of *divine* institutions. But is our Church a human institution ? The author contends (p. 20) that she is at least "a portion of the Church of Christ," and that Protestants should not "hesitate to allow that she is a true Christian Church." If Christian, she is divine, — for Christ is God ; and then she is not a human institution, unless God and man are identical, which the author would be as unwilling as we to assert. Then from the fact that human institutions are not wholly good or wholly bad it does not follow that the Church is not wholly good, for she is not a human institution. The author's reasoning labors under the fallacy termed by logicians *transitio a genere ad genus*, and therefore does not transfer his inconsistency from himself to his subject. He evidently says too much or not enough. Too much, if he holds our Church to be a mere human institution ; for if such, she is, as we often say, a gigantic imposition upon mankind, since she claims to be the Church of God, and, as a church, must be wholly bad. Not enough, if he holds her to be divine or Christian ; for in the divine all is good, and nothing bad ; and we are forbidden

to discriminate, but must praise indiscriminately, since to pronounce anything divine bad would be to blaspheme God. This is an awkward dilemma, and yet it is one in which every Protestant places himself who undertakes to vindicate to us as Catholics a Christian character, while he claims a Christian character for himself. There is no medium. The Protestant must either concede or deny all our Church claims.

But we have no disposition to dwell on the author's inconsistencies. He has evidently intended to be fair and candid, and we are sure that he has written with kindly feelings and friendly motives what he has actually thought and felt ; and it does not surprise us, that, unacquainted as he is with the inner sense of our religion, he should fail to speak like a Catholic, with theological accuracy, or with even logical consistency. The child usually creeps before it walks, and lisps before it speaks. We cannot expect Protestants to go to bed at night in their heresies and errors, and to wake up in the morning sound and well-instructed Catholics. We must expect their approach to us to be gradual, now throwing off one error and taking up one truth, and now another ; and though such approach can avail nothing for the salvation of those who stop short of unity, it may have an important influence in preparing the future conversion of the Protestant populations. We therefore welcome it as a favorable symptom, and cannot repel it, because we see clearly enough its insufficiency. All truth is ours, and it is our privilege as Catholics to acknowledge and reverence it wherever we find it, whatever the dialect in which it is spoken or the garb in which it is dressed. Mr. Field's errors and inconsistencies belong to his abnormal position, and to his sect ; the truths he utters are ours, and his utterance of them does him honor as a man. He has, indeed, attained to less of Catholic thought, and enters less into the Catholic spirit, than he imagines ; but he has made some progress from the rabble of his brethren, — has got rid of many foolish and unjust prejudices, and become pretty well convinced that Protestantism is far from embracing all truth, and that Protestants are very far from possessing all the piety and virtue of Christendom. This is much, and may become more. He says many things of our Church that we can accept without modification ; but his *Letter* interests us chiefly for the picture it gives us, by contrast, of Protestantism. We pay little attention to what those without say in our favor, but what they say against themselves we regard as entitled to some respect. They must be

presumed to be acquainted with their own religion, and to have no motive to disparage it. We take Mr. Field's praise of us as so much dispraise of Protestants ; and when he commends something in our Church, and proposes it to them for imitation, we regard him as acknowledging that it is an excellence which we have that they have not. In this point of view, his Letter is a severe condemnation of Protestantism ; for most of the things he commends in our Church come under the head of the cardinal virtues, or pertain to the essential principles of the Christian religion, without which there is no sanctity, and no inquiry whether there is a Christian life can even be entertained.

The author begins by describing the ceremonies of Holy Week at Rome, at which he assisted. These, he tells us, left a very unfavorable impression on his mind, nay, absolutely shocked and disgusted him. At this we are not surprised ; for they were strange to him, contrary to what he had been accustomed, and he assisted at them to see and criticize, not to worship. We give him credit for trying to be impartial ; but he could only imperfectly understand their significance and appropriateness ; he could not enter into their spirit, or feel that he had lot or part in them ; and, at best, he could view them only as a mere curious spectator. We should have been, knowing his habits, tastes, and position, far more surprised if he had found them edifying. The things which he complains of, however, are for the most part mere accessories, dictated by national usage and taste, and form no essential part of Catholic faith or Catholic worship. That they should not be agreeable to a New England Puritan is easily understood ; but, after all, his habits and tastes may possibly be as much at fault as those which dictated the things which offend him. The firing of cannon, the waving of plumes and banners, in connection with religious ceremonies, may not be in accordance even with our own individual taste ; yet our judgment does not disapprove them, and we do not know what right we have to erect our individual taste, formed by our Puritanical training, and therefore very questionable, into a standard to which all mankind must conform or be voted dis-tasteful.

But Mr. Field had the candor and the good sense not to take up with his first impressions, and proceed no farther. The following is very honorable to him : —

“ Such was my first impression. Truth now compels me to say that I have attended other services of the Catholic Church less ostentatious, which have had upon me a very different effect. I go

often to the Convent of Trinitá dei Monti, to hear the nuns sing their evening hymn, and it would be quite impossible for me to describe the effect upon my feelings. I listen till my heart dissolves. It seems as if some choir of the blessed were chanting a celestial hymn; as if that tender and plaintive melody, which comes to bear up my soul from gloom, were the distant music of angels.

"Ofttimes, too, at such an hour, I see the most simple and earnest devotion kneeling on the pavement of the church. I ask no questions, but there is a *look* which tells me that the thoughts of the worshipper are fixed on something beyond this world, — a look of sorrow and yet of peace. And often I say to myself, as I see men and women who have evidently led a life of extreme poverty and suffering kneeling on the church floor, 'While we sneer at their worship, these poor beings are ascending to heaven.'

"The contrast of these different services produces in my mind a confused feeling in regard to the Roman Church. I see evil there, but I see good also. And if I denounce the one, I will not deny or disparage the other.

"Besides, the fact stares me in the face that this Church has produced innumerable Saints, — some of an order of saintliness which has hardly a parallel in the world's history. If she has had a Cæsar Borgia, she has had also a Charles Borromeo, a Francis Xavier, a Pascal and Fénelon. I often go to the Church of Jesus in this city to muse at the tomb of Ignatius Loyola. This simple inscription is written over his body: AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM. Was ever epitaph more simple or just? And shall I deny that such a man was a Christian, when his heroic self-denial, his voluntary poverty and labors, put to shame the Protestant world?

"Farther observation has led me to modify still further my views of the Roman Catholic Church; to discover in it many things beautiful, of happy influence, and worthy of imitation. To these I am happy to bear a tribute of admiration. Our condemnation as Protestants of what is bad would come with a better grace, and produce more effect, if we showed a readiness to appreciate and acknowledge what is good. There are several pleasing aspects which I wish particularly to notice: —

"First, — 'The Catholic Church eminently cherishes the feeling of reverence. Its history, its associations, its very architecture, contribute to this. Its age of itself makes it venerable, and supplies many touching associations which Protestantism wholly wants. It has been the faith of a large part of mankind for eighteen centuries. Millions have staked their eternal salvation upon its truth, and supported the agonies of life and of death upheld by its hope. They have found in its communion comfort, joy, and peace. A cloud of witnesses seems to fill the arches of every cathedral, and stretch forward like a shining column into heaven.

"Often, as I stand at twilight in some old cathedral, leaning against a column which has stood while centuries have been rushing past it, — just as the last rays of the dying day gleam through the stained windows, shedding 'a dim, religious light' on the marble monuments and the kneeling worshippers, and as the vesper hymn is filling the vault above, —

'Dimly on my soul streams the light of ages.'

Then, more than at any other hour, I feel myself united to all the living and the dead, — a unit in that mighty host which is hurrying to the unknown, yet inseparable from the rest. I think how many have come up here to drink the waters of life and gone away to die in peace. On this pavement generations have knelt, and looked up to heaven, and now 'the sheeted dead' seem still to walk here. An invisible bond unites me to all the human souls that are kneeling at my side. I should feel guilty if I dared to disown my brotherhood to them. I feel that we are one family, one great brotherhood of guilt and misery, and that I can unite in their prayers.

"Again, — The arrangements of the Catholic worship seem to me peculiarly fitted to nourish a spirit of devotion. Its churches are open at all hours, and my observation is that I have seldom entered a Catholic church that I did not find some individual — some poor man or woman — absorbed in prayer, and often with a look so eloquent of woe, and yet of that peace which passeth understanding, that I have wished that I might receive the same consolation.

"The *hours* of devotion are chosen with a wise discernment of the periods at which man is naturally disposed to reflection and to prayer, — to thoughts of a better world. The Church celebrates the rising and the setting of the sun with her matin and vesper hymns. As the sunset touches with its last rays the mountain-tops, the shepherd on the hills and in the valleys hears the evening bells that call him to prayer. How touching is that music of the convent bell ringing among the mountains! The air seems hushed and holy. Nature unites in the worship of man.

" 'Blessed be the hour,
The time, the clime, the spot, where I so oft
Have felt that moment in its fullest power
Sink o'er the earth so beautiful and soft,
While swung the deep bell in the distant tower,
Or the faint, dying day-hymn stole aloft,
And not a breath crept through the rosy air,
And yet the forest leaves seemed stirred with prayer.' "

— pp. 6 - 9.

This is well written, and indicates deep sensibility, a warm heart, and a rich imagination. The sentiment so eloquently

approved, and the absence of which in his own communion the author so feelingly laments, cannot be found out of our Church. What the author really feels and expresses is not the sentiment of reverence itself, but his own sense of the want of it among Protestants, and his strong emotions at beholding it in Catholics. Protestantism cannot be reverential, for it has nothing to reverence. It has no fund of rich associations ; no stock of cherished memories ; no patrimony ; no long line of noble and heroic ancestors ; no " cloud of witnesses to fill the arches of every " meeting-house, " and to stretch forward like a shining column into heaven." It has broken from the " communion of saints," and its children cannot look upon the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, upon the saintly and heroic preachers of the Gospel who won the nations to the Cross by their missionary labors, their toils and privations, their prayers and vigils, their mortifications and austerities, their crucifixion to all worldly ties and affections, their tears, and their blood, — as members of their own household, or claim them as their own kith and kin. To these Christian noblemen, these honored servants of God, these champions of truth and love, to whom we owe it that we are not sunk in the chaos of barbarism, or in the fetid pool of idolatry and superstition, they feel that they are strangers, and that in their glory they have no share. The link which should have connected them in one glorious brotherhood with them has been severed, or never formed, and they can at best only half persuade themselves that possibly it may hereafter be formed or reunited in some remotely future world. Protestantism is of yesterday, and the heroic ages of the Christian Church it does not and cannot inherit. When our Protestant friend summons up the long line of saints and martyrs who have adorned the annals of religion, and says he does not disown his brotherhood to them, he only expresses his weariness of his own isolation, and the joy he conceives it would be to be able to feel himself of their brotherhood ; — in a word, his deep longing, the inward yearning of his heart for " the communion of Saints."

As Catholics, we cannot enter into his feelings, we cannot sympathize with his emotions. We are " to the manner born." All this, which so powerfully affects the imagination of our Protestant friend, is with us a matter of course, and we enjoy it as we do the air and sunshine of heaven, pure water from the brook or fountain, or as a gentleman does his estate which has descended to him, through father and son, from

time immemorial. The saints — all who have heroically served their neighbour in their lives or in their deaths, and secured the approbation of their God — are of our household, members of our family, our own dear relations, with whom we live, and daily and hourly converse, as with our most familiar acquaintances and bosom friends. It is not surprising to us, that our Protestant ministers, who are conscious that they have no Christian antiquity, no heroic ages, no spiritual chivalry, no saints, no martyrs, in a word, no ancestors, — who feel that they have sprung up in the night, like the mushroom from the dung-hill, and are oppressed with a sense of their newness and isolation from all that is grand, beautiful, holy, or inspiring in religious history, — should long for our privileges, and half envy us their possession ; but it does surprise us, that they should not see, that, in acknowledging that we inherit Christian antiquity, they condemn their own communions, and exclude themselves from the heritage of the Gospel. They who are not one with the Church in all ages cannot share in the associations, recollections, and achievements of all ages.

The author appears to be charmed with the monastic institutions of the Church.

“ Another winning feature of the Catholic Church is *the repose* which its numerous institutions offer to the weary, the broken heart. Protestantism has no cloisters, — no places of holy retreat, to which a man broken with the labors of life, or with private grief, or sick of the selfishness of the world, can retire to pass his days in devotion, and in communion with the wise and good of other days, or in labors of charity and mercy.

“ To an old man, — if without children, or if they are dead, or his lot is hard, or his life unhappy, — I can conceive of nothing more grateful than such a retreat as he approaches the evening of life. There the seductions or the treachery of the world cannot reach him. He is secluded from its occupations, and heavy, wearying care. Hours of study alternate with the gentle religious excitement of matins and vespers. His life has been full of sorrow, and now he finds a soothing repose in the monastery which creates a solitude in the heart of a city, — the stillness of its paved court broken only by the murmur of a fountain, and its long corridors echoing only to the footfall of some passing solitary who has retired from the world. In the lonely imprisoned cell, the lamp suspended from the ceiling lets fall its light on the bald head of the aged pilgrim bending over the pages of St. Augustine,

‘ The scrolls that teach him to live and die.’

In former ages, monastic institutions had a high literary utility. Never have I seen a monastery afar on the top of a mountain, glowing in the sunset, without recognizing gratefully a luminary of the Middle Ages,—one of those stations along which the torch of knowledge was transmitted from summit to summit while the world beneath lay buried in darkness. The importance of these institutions to learning is lessened, now that the sun shines down into the valleys as well as on the hill-tops. But as places of religious seclusion, I cannot but wish that there were some such retreats in Protestant lands, to which a man who has nothing more on earth to live for could retire to calm the fever of his mind, and prepare to go to God.

“The Catholic Church deserves also great honor for her charitable institutions. She has erected monasteries in lonely and almost inaccessible places; on the top of the Alps and of Mount Sinai; amid perpetual snows and frightful deserts, to extend assistance and relief to lost or helpless travellers. I walked over the Pass of the Simplon with an Episcopal clergyman, and I remember well his animated exclamation, as we first caught sight of the Hospice on the top of the mountain,—‘There is what the Catholic Church does!’ And I confess I could resist any abstract argument better than the Monks of St. Bernard, or the Sisters of Charity.” — pp. 10, 11.

We find no fault with this as far as it goes, for it is all that we could expect from a Protestant minister; but how far short it falls of the Catholic thought which has generated and sustained monastic institutions, we have no occasion to inform our Catholic readers. Mr. Field's thought, singularly enough in one who protests earnestly and eloquently against the prevailing humanism of the day, remains in the humanitarian order, and makes the monastery simply a sort of Sailor's Snug Harbour for those who are weary of the storms and tempests of life, or too old or too feeble to buffet them. This is something, as was the generous provision made in his will by an Eastern Emir for the erection and support of a hospital for old and worn-out horses; but far different was the thought which gave birth to the monastery, and which has continued to sustain it through the lapse and changes of wellnigh twenty centuries. This thought was that of SACRIFICE, which lies at the bottom of all worship. It was not simply the desire to retreat from the world, to throw off its cares, its responsibilities, and to lead a calm and indolent life away from its troubles and temptations, but to immolate one's whole self to God, to die, to be crucified, unto all, in order to live only unto God. For the weak and the way-worn, for the old and the sick of heart, still pertaining to the

world, the monastery was an *hospice*, an asylum ; but, to the monks themselves, it was the cross to which they were nailed, — the altar on which they offered themselves, heart and soul, body and mind, reason and will, — the place of trial and suffering, of labor and vigil, of fasting and prayer, of pain and mortification, though of interior peace and consolation, — the list into which the aspirants, as skilful and determined *athletæ*, entered to struggle even unto death for the crown of life to be given to the victors by the Sovereign's own hand. It is not when the old and infirm, who have outlived their worldly pleasures and affections, or when they whom early misfortune, disappointments, or blight have sickened with the world and rendered unable to bear its rude breath or its scornful eye, retreat from society, and wait in concealment and silence for death to relieve them of their burdens, that the Catholic sees the peculiar beauty and worth of the monastery ; but it is when the strong and the beautiful, in the bloom of life, in the freshness of their thoughts and affections, for whom the world is full of promise and society reserves its choicest pleasures and its richest honors, turn their backs upon them all, and, adorning themselves as the bride for the bridegroom, offer their virgin hearts and virgin bodies on the altar of sacrifice, and pledge themselves to their celestial Spouse, to be his, and his only, for time and eternity, that the Catholic heart swells with admiration, that Catholic eyes fill with tears of thanksgiving and joy, and pious souls fall down and adore the wondrous power of Divine grace.

The following throws a strong light on Protestantism, and shows its utter worthlessness under its least objectionable aspect, under which one would expect it to have, at least, some appearance of merit.

“ I believe no church is so faithful to the sick and to orphans as the Church of Rome. In hospitals, the Sisters of Charity are the most faithful watchers, performing the most menial services with their own hands ; and, much as I dislike their vows, I can never see these sisters pass in the streets of our cities without a feeling of pitying admiration.

“ When a city is visited by plague or cholera, the Catholic priest has the feeling of a soldier in the hour of danger. If his people ever need him, they need him then. And the priest never deserts his flock, while the Protestant minister often flees with precipitation.

“ No other church is so faithful to the poor, and to this I ascribe the hold which she has on the Irish peasantry and on the masses

wherever her faith prevails. She has accomplished that greatest task of any religion, — to make it penetrate the lower strata of society, — to make it sink down into the ocean of popular ideas and affections.

“ In countries where the Catholic Church is dominant, religion has at least some hold on all classes. The lowest, the most degraded, have some touch of religious sentiment about them, some veneration for sacred things, some sensibility to holy influences. The Irish peasant, the Sicilian beggar, still keep some fraction of Christian faith, even in circumstances fitted to cast down and brutalize human nature. They do not sink to such brutish degradation as the same class in Protestant countries. They are not such *animals* as the low population of London, the haggard wretches of St. Giles. It appears to me that it is the highest triumph of the Catholic religion that it has infused some touch of heavenly love and hope into such stern and savage breasts.

“ Eternal honor to the Catholic Church for this, — that she makes no distinction between the rich and the poor! In that church, as before God, all men are on a level. In the immense multitude that prostrate themselves on the floor of the cathedral, the rich and the poor, the prince and the laboring man, kneel side by side, and feel that God is the maker of them all. The thought of their Creator and of their immortality, that rushes over them at such a moment, makes them equal.

“ To all conditions of men the Church administers the same sacraments, from baptism in childhood to extreme unction in the hour of dissolution. When the poor man is taken sick, the priest is at his bedside to administer the consolations of religion; and over the departing soul of the poorest of her children the Church pronounces her last benediction, — ‘ Go forth, O Christian soul! from this world, in the name of God, the Father Almighty, who created thee; in the name of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who suffered for thee; in the name of the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth thee. When thy soul shall depart from thy body, let the resplendent multitude of the angels meet thee; let the triumphant army of the martyrs, clad in their white robes, conduct thee.’

“ Being pervaded by the same sentiment of religion, there is a *sympathy between all classes*, where all belong to the same communion, which, in our divided Protestant communities, does not exist. The tendency of sects is to isolate a man from his neighbour, to make him selfish, clannish, and proud.

“ It is perhaps owing to this difference of religion, that there is much less of aristocratic pride and assumption in Catholic countries. Their religion has at least a softening and beautiful effect upon *manners*. In persons of the highest rank, they are softened by a courtesy which the burly Englishman, or the purse-proud

American, never knows. I believe there is more *pride*, more insolence, in England, than on the whole continent of Europe. I do not suppose that their religion has produced this pride, but it certainly has not prevented it.

"Protestantism seems to have no machinery to reach the poorer classes. The most that has been done in England or in this country has been done by the Methodists. But the spirit of our churches generally is worldly, self-seeking. They court the rich. The ambition of a Protestant minister, even in democratic America, is to be the head of an aristocratic congregation. The churches themselves are a kind of religious aristocracy. In New York, for example, what a rivalry as to which congregation shall be most *exclusive*! The very buildings in which they worship are constructed as if on purpose to shut out the poor. They are arranged just like a theatre, *in boxes*, which are sold to the highest bidder, and all are held at such a price that the poor are almost as a matter of necessity excluded.

"I may be wanting in reverence, but to me *a fashionable church* is about as sacred a place as a fashionable theatre. One is as much devoted to the god of this world as the other. Both are fitted up with gay or gaudy decorations. Both resorted to by very fashionable audiences for curiosity or display. The principal feeling excited or gratified is poor, pitiful human vanity. In the church, as in the theatre, the audience are entertained for an hour with public speaking in which there is an occasional religious reflection or sentiment, about as solemn, though by no means as eloquent, as the moralizing of Hamlet. From both places the public, or the poorer part of it, are strictly excluded.

"How Christianity is to penetrate the whole mass of society by the agency of such churches surpasses my comprehension. Sad would be the fate of the world, if its moral condition or happiness depended on these fashionable Christians, who are giddy with folly and dissipation half the year, but — religiously abstain from the opera during Lent!" — pp. 12–15.

This speaks for itself, and should for ever silence those who pretend that Protestantism is favorable to the million. But here is another passage which proves equally the worthlessness of Protestantism as the medium of maintaining faith in Christianity as a divine revelation.

"Lastly, I honor the Catholic Church for this, — that it has held inflexibly to its high ground, that Christianity is a divine religion; not merely what Mr. Emerson or Mr. Parker *thinks*, or what any body *supposes*; but that it is the eternal truth of God; not a system of philosophy like that of Plato, or a mere classification of natural laws which man has discovered, but a revelation from the in-

visible world, which the Son of God has come down from heaven to give to mankind. We have been so long trying to explain everything in the Christian religion, from a wish to make its truth and evidence palpable to all, that we have insensibly let go the sublimity and grandeur of this mighty faith. We have sought to reduce its mysteries to the level, not only of the highest, but of the most vulgar comprehension; to classify its stupendous facts under the ordinary course of nature. Some have gone so far as to reduce Christ to be a mere man, his miracles to be merely natural phenomena, and his teachings to be simply the wise sayings of a virtuous philosopher. Christianity is merely the reiteration of those general laws of the mind which we knew before, or might have known, from our own consciousness. When we have reached this point, what place is left for faith, or for anything that had been before called religion? What need of temples, and altars, and anthems to bear up the soul on high? The church becomes merely a hall for public lectures, and human flattery and compliment take the place of the prostration of man before his Maker.

"I do not wonder that some minds, when they reach this lowest point of belief, or disbelief, rush back from it into the unquestioning faith of the Church of Rome. A dark, half-understood faith, mysterious yet sublime, is better than total unbelief, than universal doubt. As they turn away sickened from the miserable transcendental philosophy of the day, which reasons God and all spiritual existences out of the world, which knows no being but man, — the faith of Rome presents itself as a refuge. There is an attraction in its mysteries, there is a solemnity in that darkness of the future and the invisible, which the Catholic Church professes to illumine but dimly, as with a few faint stars twinkling in the midnight sky, which casts over the soul a spell as deep and awful as the shadow of eternity.

"Better even an excess of veneration and belief than a total abnegation of faith. Better even for the intellect, for the arts, for poetry and eloquence, which can only live in an atmosphere of faith; and infinitely better for the character. Superstition may be a weakness, but it is the error, though of an ignorant, yet of a sincere and truth-loving mind. Skepticism, still farther from the truth, is the error of an understanding but half instructed, yet conceited and flippant. Better any extreme of credulity than this, the laugh and gibber of a low, licentious, sneering infidelity.

"The Catholic Church, I think, deserves the thanks of all Christendom for this, — that it has held so firmly that Christianity is a divine religion, the direct revelation of God, and eternal and immutable as its Author. Standing on this foundation, that church asserts the majesty of religion above all the interests of this world, in face of the secularizing influences of a commercial, and the sneers and scoffs of a skeptical age.

“ And she is not ashamed to bear her cross before the world ! I confess I like those popular signs of its faith, crucifixes and oratories by the way-side, which are the landmarks of a Catholic country. I once looked on all such things as superstition ; but now they produce on me rather a pleasant impression. I like, as I enter a foreign country, to be greeted with some token that I am entering a Christian land. A Protestant country you may travel through, from one end to the other, without meeting a single symbol of the national faith. You see buildings devoted to religious worship, but whether Christian temples, or Mohammedan mosques, or Hebrew synagogues, no visible sign tells. But over every Catholic Church a silent cross proclaims *whose name* they bear. Along the highways stand a thousand shrines like so many fountains, inviting the pilgrim to stop and drink of living waters. I confess I love to see these things ; as I travel through strange kingdoms, to behold here and there the blessed symbol of my faith standing in a grove of pines, or on some headland overlooking the deep ; and as I see it standing at the head of those swelling mounds, which mark where we all must lie, it gives me a firmer hold of my immortality. It seems to say, ‘ I am the resurrection and the life : he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.’ ” — pp. 16 – 18.

It is a little remarkable that a Protestant minister should mark it as a signal merit of the Catholic Church, that she has never ceased to assert that Christianity is a divine revelation. What must be his estimate of his own religion, when he acknowledges that ours is, in this respect, honorably distinguished from it ? It is clear in his mind, that, if it had not been for our Church, the idea of Christianity as a positive, divine revelation, in contradistinction from mere philosophy or Rationalism, would have been lost, and the world would have lapsed into the abyss of infidelity, — in a word, that it is to her that Protestants themselves are indebted for even the preservation of Christianity in the world. This is, no doubt, true ; but how can a Protestant acknowledge it ? Is it not fatal to his own communion ?

Mr. Field says he does not wonder at persons who recoil from the abyss of infidelity going over to Rome, but seems to imply that, if these persons were acquainted with some of the higher forms of Protestant Christianity, they might satisfy themselves without taking so long a journey. But if the world is indebted to the Roman Catholic Church, as it undoubtedly is, for the preservation of the belief in Christianity as a divine revelation, how could we be saved from the abyss of infidelity out of that Church ? It follows necessarily from what he con-

cedes, that no form of Protestantism has power to save from infidelity ; and if not, how can any form of Protestantism be a secure refuge to those who would be Christian believers ? The fact is, that all those who, like ourselves, have been converted from Protestant Rationalism or Transcendentalism to the Roman Catholic Church, are as well acquainted with the higher forms of Protestantism as with the lower, and it was from the higher we had descended to the lower ; when we recoiled from the lower, we went to Rome, because we knew that there was nothing in these higher forms that could save us from relapsing into the lower.

All Protestant communions may be divided into three classes : — 1. The Genevan, or Calvinistic ; 2. The Anglican, or Episcopalian ; 3. The Unitarian, or Rationalistic. The best that Protestantism has to offer is to be found in one or another of these three classes ; and he who cannot find the Gospel in some one of these need not hope to find it in the Protestant world. The first class embraces all the sects commonly called Evangelical. Their principle is enthusiasm, and their fruit fanaticism, alike repugnant to faith and to reason. Anglicanism, or Protestant Episcopalianism, embracing Lutheranism in so far as Lutheranism is not Evangelicalism, is mere formalism, — what Carlyle calls a “ sham.” It is the broken hull of Catholicity, emptied of its kernel, and has nothing to feed the famishing soul. Doubtless both of these classes recognize many Christian truths, and retain large portions of Christian ethics ; but these, if not defended on Rationalistic principles, must be defended on Catholic principles. If we defend them on Rationalistic principles, we necessarily, as our author will not deny, precipitate ourselves into the yawning abyss of infidelity ; if on Catholic principles, we cannot stop short of Catholicity, — save at the expense of our logic, — where they exist in their unity and integrity. Not one of these truths ever has been or ever can be defended against the Unitarians, or third class, save on principles which equally defend the Roman Catholic Church. Here is the difficulty under which Protestantism, so long as it professes to be Christian, necessarily labors. It is always too much or too little for itself. No man capable of reasoning consecutively, and whose intellect is not warped by passion or prejudice, can for a moment avoid either sinking to the lowest depths of infidelity, or rising to Catholicity.

Then, again, as a matter of fact, the active living men

amongst Protestants are all dissatisfied with every existing form of Protestantism; and if they cling to a particular form, it is never for what it is, but for what they hope or persuade themselves it may become. Our author himself has no sympathy with Evangelicalism, and he would reform it by inducing it to copy the principal features of Catholicity; and he stands by no means alone. There is a deep feeling among our New England ministers, that Evangelicalism is far from being the adequate expression of Christianity, and that it by no means answers the great ends of a divine religion, as we have had ample means of knowing, and of which we have ample proofs in our own possession. What is Dr. Bushnell's movement but a revolt against Evangelicalism, now in favor of Rationalism, now in favor of Mysticism, and now even in favor of Catholicity? Protestant Episcopalians, with their kindred, may talk emphatically of their church and their "admirable liturgy," but none of them appear to be satisfied with their church as it actually is, and most of them, whether in England or in this country, are at work to develop it, some in favor of Evangelicalism, some in favor of Catholicity, others, like Whately and his school, in favor of Unitarianism, or Rationalism. Unitarians acknowledge with one accord that they have not found what they want, and never expect to come to the knowledge of the truth. The late Dr. Channing, a short time before his death, made the remarkable confession, in a letter to a friend, that, though he approved of his past course, and believed Unitarianism had been useful in combating Calvinism, he still looked for the manifestation of a higher form of Christian truth and of Christian life. These are facts which have their significance, and which prove, that, in recoiling from infidelity, we have no resource but to fall back on the Catholic Church, not merely to satisfy our imaginations or our sensibilities, but our sober reason. There is nothing else, even on the showing of the sects themselves, for us to fall back upon.

We, who have run through the higher as well as the lower forms of Protestantism, are not to be put off with a mere abstraction, which has nothing positive, definite, and is nothing but the negation of Catholicity, and the assertion of anything we please in general, and nothing in particular. It is here that Protestants delude themselves. Our author claims to be a Protestant, and yet it is evident from his letter that there is no form of Protestantism that he believes to be the adequate

expression of Christian doctrine, or which is able to produce and support the genuine Christian life. But what is this Protestantism in general, which is nowhere realized in a specific or individual form? The general, abstracted from the particular, has no existence, and is only a mere possibility, not an actuality. Protestantism exists only as Evangelicalism, formalism, or Rationalism; and he who is not an adherent of one or another of these, though he may be no Catholic, is no Protestant,—is in Christian countries nothing at all,—belongs, as it is said in the language of the day, to the “Big Church,” that is, the “Nothingarian.” It is idle to ask us to be Protestants in general and not Protestants in particular,—to embrace a mere abstraction and not a real thing. If we are to be Protestants, we must embrace some particular form, enter some particular communion; and if you yourselves cannot offer us any such communion, which, as it is, and not merely as you are hoping it one day will be, is in your own belief the true Christian communion, you should not sneer at us for going to Rome, since that, according to yourselves, is our only refuge from infidelity; for to ask us to make a church for ourselves, or to remain in a false communion till you have succeeded in forming the true one, is asking quite too much of us. Life is short, and death is near at hand: we have no vocation ourselves to make a church, and you seem to have just as little; for you appear to be no nearer getting a true church constructed than you were three hundred years ago. You are busy, we grant; but unless God build the house, how shall they prosper who build it? Does the Church of Christ now exist in its integrity, or does it not?

Perhaps, were our Protestant friend to look closer into the matter, he would find that we who have gone over to Rome did not go because we had become disgusted with this or that particular form of Protestantism, in a fit of ill-humor or despair,—in obedience to the craving of a morbid sensibility, or of a disorderly imagination. Perhaps he would find that we need no such apology as he generously volunteers for us,—that, in fact, we did not fall into that abyss of Transcendentalism and infidelity till we had examined the higher forms of Protestantism, and found them empty, or go into the Church but upon full and sober conviction. And perhaps, too, if he should form his conclusions from our Catholic faith as our Church teaches it, instead of forming them from his own glosses, he would not hold it necessary to defend superstition

in order to defend the reasonableness of our conversion. It is amusing as well as painful to witness the absurd mistakes which even able and well-disposed Protestants fall into in regard to our faith ; and we must tell even the able and well-disposed, that, while we appreciate their motives, and honor them for their good intentions, their apologies are hardly less offensive to us than the most bitter accusations they could bring against us. However, our kind-hearted friend has intended nothing offensive, and while we refuse to accept his well-meant apology for us and our brother converts, we assure him that we only wish him to be able from his own experience to see its absurdity, and the little need we have of it, or of any apology for renouncing error and embracing truth, — for leaving the Protestant conventicle for the Catholic Church.

We have laid before our readers “ the good ” which Mr. Field finds in the Church, and the conclusion is evident, that, in his mind, — however the case may stand as to doctrine, in which he admits we are substantially orthodox, — the Christian life is to be found, at least in its perfection, only in our communion. This is enough for us, and we will not press him with the logical consequences which naturally follow from it ; for we trust, in due time, with God’s grace, he will see them for himself. As to “ the bad ” he finds in the Church, it really amounts to little. We pay too great a regard to *relics*, have too many ceremonies in our worship, use in the service of the Church a dead language, find too great a facility of pardon in the confessional, have a source of abuse in the celibacy of the clergy, and have too many monks. Here is the whole list, we believe. We have no intention, at present, of discussing these subjects at length. The recent revolutions in Europe are fast removing the last abuse, if abuse it be, and there is no danger of the monastic orders becoming too crowded, at least for some time to come. The celibacy of the clergy is not a debatable question at this late day. If it were productive of evil, experience would have demonstrated the fact long before this ; and it would be giving the Church little credit for that consummate policy she is said to profess and practise, to suppose, that, if experience had so demonstrated, she would continue to insist on it, since it is within her competency to abolish it. Did it never occur to our friend, that the very fact that the Church insists on the celibacy of the clergy in face of the opposition it encounters, and after ages of experience, is a palpable proof that it is not an abuse, that

its practical effect is good, and that she has good and solid reasons for insisting on it? As to the use of a dead language, we are surprised that such a man as Mr. Field should find it an objection. Just consider the number of languages and dialects in the world, the constant changes and alterations they undergo, and ask, if a more unreasonable proposition was ever put forth, than that the Church should translate her sacred offices into them all, many of which have never been written languages, have no grammar, and no alphabet. And what need is there of it? The prayers are addressed to God and not to the worshippers, and he can understand, we presume, Latin as well as English or French. As to the ceremonies objected to, if, as the author says, they were borrowed from the Jewish worship, they were originally prescribed by God himself, and therefore cannot be in themselves objectionable, but must be, one would be disposed to think, such as God himself approves. The Catholic Church teaches that the Jewish worship was prescribed by divine authority, and remains in force save so far as repealed by the New Law.

On the other two points, we have now only one or two suggestions to offer. The author recognizes true Saints in our Church, and names some; and we request him to take notice that those whom he recognizes for Saints were remarkable for their veneration of the Saints, the honor they paid to sacred relics, and the frequency with which they approached the confessional; and that we never find a Saint, nor an eminently pious Catholic, of whom we are not obliged to say as much. Has our friend meditated this fact? Did St. Francis of Sales, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Vincent of Paul, or even Fénelon, ever hint that these things were abuses and needed reforming? Are not such men as these better judges of what favors the growth of sanctity, than is a stranger to our Church, who can judge only according to uncertain speculation from uncertain data? May it not be that there is a connection between these things and holiness of life, which our Protestant friend, with his Protestant eyes, does not perceive? Let him produce an instance of real eminent sanctity disconnected from them.

The author nowhere shows himself to so little advantage as when speaking of confession, and he proves himself by no means well informed when he reckons *Pascal* among Catholic Saints. *Pascal* was no Saint, and not even a Catholic. He

was a Jansenist, and therefore a heretic ; and his life shows, that, whatever were the austerities he practised, he was lacking in the Christian virtue of humility, without which there is no sanctity. The author does not appear to have made himself at all acquainted with the ordinary Catholic expositions of the sacrament of Penance. He fancies that the main end of confession is the relief of a scrupulous conscience, and to reassure the self-distrustful. Beyond this he thinks it is an abuse, or only an indulgence to sin. What blunders sensible men will commit when they venture to speak on topics of which they are ignorant ! “ Many a bad man,” he says, “ sins with a light heart, thinking that he can get a release from the Divine penalty by whispering into the ear of the priest. Confession relieves his conscience altogether too easily.” (p. 24.) How does our friend know this, since he has never believed or practised confession ? Even if what he says were true, he is rash in saying it, for he has no sufficient reason for saying it. But there is no truth in it. The bad man supposed knows, if he knows anything of his religion, that to sin presuming on pardon is an additional sin of presumption ; and he knows, also, that he cannot receive pardon unless he has all that Protestants understand by *repentance*, and that, if he should approach the sacrament with an impenitent heart, without sorrow for his sin, and a firm resolution to forsake it and obey God for the future, he would not only not obtain pardon, but would commit the sin of sacrilege. No Catholic is so ignorant as not to know that something more than whispering in the ear of the priest is necessary to obtain pardon for his sins. The simple fact is, that, in this matter of forgiveness, Protestants hold that there is forgiveness of sins on repentance, without confession ; and Calvinists hold that all sins, past, present, and to come, are forgiven at once ; — we, that there is none with confession, without repentance. So we make the matter more difficult than they do, requiring all they require, and confession into the bargain. The author mistakes the motive which he tacitly assumes the Reformers had in rejecting confession : it was not to make pardon less easy, but to remove an unpleasant restraint ; for confession is anything but agreeable to flesh and blood. As to its being an indulgence to sin, that is all moonshine. Is it an indulgence to sin to say that God pardons the penitent for Christ's sake ? No man dares say it, and what more do we say in the sacrament of Penance ?

We request the attention of the author to a well-known fact in all Catholic countries, that the pious, the devout, they who aspire to Christian perfection, and who really adorn their religion, and extort the admiration of Protestants by their virtues, go regularly and often to confession, and some of the greatest Saints confess daily ; while the bad, the profane, the licentious, the men who dishonor their manhood by their vices and their religion by their profligate lives, the very persons Protestants throw in our faces as fruits of Catholicity, rarely, if ever, approach the tribunal of Penance ; and the first thing the good priest, in order to reform them, attempts, is to bring them to it. Here is a fact worth all the speculation in the world. If confession were an abuse, if sinners were made worse by frequently confessing, the fact would be as little likely to escape the observation of the Catholic pastor as of our Protestant minister ; and if he found such to be the fact, why should he resort to it as the most efficient means of reforming them ? Why should he spend days and nights in the most arduous and painful labors to get sinners to confess and in hearing their confessions ? The most painful and laborious part of his mission is that of hearing confessions ; and why should a good, intelligent, faithful, and zealous priest impose this task upon himself, if aware that it is not only of no use, but of real injury to the souls of his flock ? He could easily, to a great extent, escape it, and without subjecting himself to canonical censure, if he chose ; and bad or indolent priests, who care nothing for the souls committed to their charge, do escape it, and with what fruit the wretched condition of their flocks bears witness. The morals of a Catholic community may always be measured by the numbers who approach, and the regularity and frequency with which they approach, the confessional and Holy Communion. Mr. Field would seem to suppose that it is the bad, the dissolute, among us that frequent the confessionals, and that these, as soon as they sin, run to the priest and confess it. Would that it were so. But it is not so ; for these are precisely the ones who keep aloof from the confessional, and, in this respect at least, are good practical Protestants. The terrible corruption in France, during the last century, began in a neglect of the sacrament of Penance ; and it is only as we succeed in bringing men to it that we succeed in reforming them. Even Anglicans are so struck with this fact, that they are trying to introduce the practice of confession into their communion.

But we have extended our remarks farther than we intended. It is not necessary to dispute these matters with our Protestant friend, for we do not perceive that he recognizes any standard according to which he proposes to reform us ; and we should think he had had enough already, in his Protestant communions, of the absurd attempt to reform the Church of God by private authority. Churchmen may need reforming in order to bring them up to the standard of the Church ; but, as recent as is the time since we became a Catholic, the proposition to reform Christ's Church sounds harshly in our ears. We cannot help thinking that Almighty God had the ability to construct, and has constructed, his Church to suit the ends for which he instituted it, and that it cannot be improved by us, or stand in need of us to repair it. After all, it seems to us not unreasonable to accept it as he has given and sustains it, and, if we do not happen to find ourselves in harmony with it, to conclude that the fault is far more likely to be ours than his or its. It seems hard that God should submit to man, but not hard that man should submit to God.

ART. III.—1. *Mores Catholici : or Ages of Faith.* By KENELM H. DIGBY, Esq. Cincinnati: Catholic Society. 1841. 8vo. Vols. I. and II.

2. *The Dark Ages : a Series of Essays intended to illustrate the State of Religion and Literature in the Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Centuries, reprinted from the "British Magazine," with Corrections, and some Additions.* By the Rev. S. R. MAITLAND, F. R. S. and F. S. A., Librarian to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, &c. London: Rivingtons. 1844. 8vo. pp. 498.

3. *The Christian Examiner and Religious Miscellany.* Boston: Crosby & Nichols. May, 1849. Art. I.

OUR attention has been specially called to "the Dark Ages" by *The Christian Examiner*, the literary and theological organ of the American Unitarians, for May last, in an article entitled *The Artistic and Romantic View of the Church of the Middle Ages*, written, as we learn from the initials appended to it, by one of the ablest and most respectable of our New

England Unitarian ministers. Aside from its theology, with which, of course, we have no sympathy, *The Christian Examiner* is second to no periodical in the country ; and it was in its pages that Channing, Norton, Ware, the Peabodys, Lamson, Walker, Frothingham, Dewey, Ripley, and others, first became generally known to the reading public, and acquired their literary reputation. We have many pleasant, as well as painful, recollections connected with it, for we were ourselves for several years counted among its contributors ; and the men who gave it a character, and made it a leading organ of New England literature as well as of Unitarian theology, were, for the most part, our personal acquaintances and friends, whose many amiable qualities, generous sentiments, private and social virtues, we always delight to remember. The writer of the article we have designated is a young man of more than ordinary natural endowments, of respectable attainments, and a cultivated taste. He is earnest, and seems really to have some principle, and to be disposed to treat those from whom he differs with fairness and candor. He shows, in the article before us, better temper, more liberal feeling, more manliness, and more loyalty to truth, than we are accustomed to meet or to expect from writers who oppose the Church, and we have read him occasionally with pleasure. His sneers are comparatively few ; his declamations are not very long, nor remarkably violent ; his reasonings, if his premises were sound, would frequently be conclusive ; and many of his criticisms are just and well merited.

The article itself is principally taken up with criticisms on various works which have recently appeared in favor of the Middle Ages, and more especially with a review of the *Mores Catholici, or Ages of Faith*, by Kenelm H. Digby, one of the most remarkable literary productions of our times. With the writer's remarks on several of these works, especially those which have emanated from the Puseyite or Oxford school, we in the main agree. The Oxford men who remain attached to Anglicanism, and even some others, in what they wrote before they abandoned it, appear to us to betray much childishness and want of manly criticism ; and their indiscriminate commendation of the Middle Ages is not less offensive to our judgment, and is even more offensive to our taste, than the indiscriminate condemnation of them so characteristic of our modern Evangelicals. Even Pugin's exclusive and excessive praise of Gothic architecture has wellnigh

turned our stomach, and driven us out of our former sober admiration of it. We have no sympathy with one-sided views in art, and just as little with the spirit that forgets that we have the same Church which our ancestors had, — that she is not dead, but living, — as dear to us as she was to the mediæval knights and monks, — as good, as wise, as powerful, as young, as fresh, as beautiful, as vigorous, as she was in the Dark Ages.

The writer in the *Christian Examiner* bestows his chief attention upon the *Mores Catholici, or Ages of Faith*. He justly praises, and, if it were possible, even overpraises, this work for its immense erudition, at once comprehensive and minute ; but he contends that it is partial, deceptive, and not to be relied on as a faithful representation of the Middle Ages. It should, he thinks, be regarded not as an historical work, properly so called, but as “ A Romance founded on Facts of Mediæval History.” It is impossible to conceive an author more thoroughly imbued with the spirit of romance, or more interesting for the rich and brilliant hues which his imagination throws over every object he presents. But the coloring he gives to the Middle Ages is his own ; he fails to present them, in their totality, as they really were, and he disguises or suppresses such of their phenomena as are not agreeable to his Catholic faith or Catholic fervor. No man, we apprehend, has carefully read Digby’s work, without feeling that there is some truth in this criticism. For ourselves, we admire the *Mores Catholici* for its various learning, its deep reverential tone, its undoubting faith, its sincere and fervent piety, and its noble appreciation of Catholic honor and Catholic heroism ; but we have never been able to give it any very high rank under the relations either of art or of science. The author is saturated with the religious, and also with the romantic, spirit of the *later* mediæval times ; he has a keen relish for art, and we are told that his merits as a painter are beyond those of an amateur ; but as a writer he exhibits very little artistic skill. He has vast learning, and he accumulates a mass of materials from all sources, near and remote, open and recondite, at which we stand aghast ; but his power to mould these materials into a proper shape, to reduce his facts to their proper places, under their proper laws, and to draw from them the proper inferences, seems to us to be more than ordinarily defective. His book is a chaos of erudition, of faith, piety, sentimentality, and romance, which, indeed, may often be

read for edification, for its gentle and subduing effects on the heart, but which can seldom be consulted with entire confidence as a work of simple instruction. It does not give us, nor does it enable us to form, a complete picture of mediæval life in its totality ; it is one-sided, often fanciful, illusory ; and its rambling character, its absorbing subjectivity, its neglect of order, of method, of proper definitions and distinctions, render it not unfrequently as apt to suggest conclusions against Catholicity as in its favor.

In reading Digby's work, we certainly receive the impression, that, in his view at least, society in the Middle Ages was in what we may regard as its normal state, really under the spiritual direction of the Church, and, with insignificant exceptions, obedient to her doctrines and to her precepts, — that the Church was in fact, as well as in right, supreme, had all things her own way, and was able to realize for society, as well as for individuals, in the secular order no less than in the spiritual, her ideal of Catholic life on earth. The facts he relates, collected from all ages and nations, appear to be intended to illustrate that life, and to prove that it was, under both the secular and religious aspects, successfully realized. Hence to him the Middle Ages are peculiarly Catholic ages, that is, "ages of faith," as he expressly denominates them ; and therefore to be not only admired, but imitated. But if this be really his view, he makes the Church responsible for their general and special character, and therefore binds himself to defend them in their totality, under their secular as well as under their religious relations, or to give up his Catholicity. This the writer in the *Examiner* has not failed to perceive, and hence he throws in Digby's face the iniquity, the vices, the corruptions, the barbarism of those ages, — which it were idle to attempt to deny or to conceal, — as a conclusive refutation of the claims of the Church as the Church of God. Undeniably false and monstrous as is the reasoning of our Unitarian friend, nevertheless, as against Digby, it is apparently sound, and not easily set aside ; for it rests on an assumption which Digby himself certainly has the appearance, at least, of making, and nowhere of denying.

Our readers are well aware that we are not among those who are continually decrying the Middle Ages ; we have frequently defended them, and are always ready to defend them, against their calumniators. We are far from believing them to have been throughout, under all their relations, so dark, so utterly

wretched, as it has been for a long time commonly imagined, and we by no means admit that the present is so far in advance of them as modern advocates of progress would persuade us ; but we have never supposed that we were bound to praise them indiscriminately ; we are far from being prepared to regard our Church as implicated in the totality of their phenomena, and we cannot permit either our friends or our enemies to lay them, with all their evil as well as their good, upon our back, and compel us to carry them with us wherever we go, or else give up our Catholic faith and worship. They are, thus taken, a load which we have no disposition to carry, and which no man has the right to insist upon our carrying. As we often say, we are Catholics of the Middle Ages, because Catholicity never varies, and undergoes no development in the sense of the believers in "the progress of the species," and because the Catholic, as a Catholic, of one age is the Catholic of every age. But as men, as affected by simply human movements, we belong to the nineteenth century, in which our lot is cast, and we labor to serve our own generation, under the conditions to which it and we are subject, without calumniating either the past or the present.

The apparent error of Digby, and the real error of his Unitarian opponent, as of nearly all the modern adversaries of the Church, is in neglecting to make a very obvious distinction between the divine element in the Middle Ages, represented by the Church, and the human element that subsisted and operated by its side ; and in failing to distribute to each of these elements its appropriate share of the collective phenomena. The secular or human element then, as before and since, held divided empire with the Church, and is answerable for a portion of the phenomena we encounter in mediæval history ; and as the Church was then not alone, was not the sole operative or efficient cause, it is obviously unjust, as well as unscientific, to hold her responsible for any portion of those phenomena, except those which, directly or indirectly, proceeded from her as their principle.

As far as the part of the Church, or her influences and effects, are concerned, Digby's work misstates, miscolors, exaggerates, nothing, and fails, if in anything, simply in falling short of the full truth. We are to distrust it only when it goes beyond the religious element, and the facts dependent on it, and claims to be a faithful picture of mediæval life in its totality, of what depended on the human as well as the divine. It is then a

false picture ; for the human element was not so Catholicized, nor, as to its independent and hostile operations, confined within so narrow limits as its author supposes ; and the Church was not so supreme, did not, in fact, exert so exclusive or so abiding a control over entire mediæval life, as he represents. Here is the grand defect of Digby's book, and here is the point on which we insist. There is no truth in the assumption which Digby appears to make, and which our Unitarian friend really does make (p. 371), that "the Church had a thousand years of almost triumphant ascendancy." In this world the Church is militant, never triumphant. Only he who perseveres unto the end is permitted to triumph. That the supremacy of the Church was generally admitted, in the Middle Ages, as a doctrine, — that she maintained an ascendancy over heresy greater than she did at some periods before them, or than she does now, — as far as our present argument is concerned, — may or may not be true ; but that she had an almost triumphant ascendancy, or anything approaching it, over the secular order, is utterly false ; and throughout the entire thousand years supposed, she had not for one moment her unrestrained freedom, and often, often, had she to struggle for her very existence against pagans, heretics, schismatics, Mahometans, and lawless, ambitious, licentious, and barbarous sovereigns. Never, indeed, did she give more unequivocal proofs of her supernatural origin and support, than in those ages of ignorance, violence, and blood, — never did she struggle with more manifest supernatural constancy and force, or win more glorious trophies to her celestial prowess ; but never found she her path beset with greater difficulties, or was her just dominion resisted by more numerous, fiercer, more powerful, or more obstinate enemies.

The assumption, that the Church reigned quietly and peacefully during the Middle Ages, is warranted by no authority, and is contradicted by the whole history of the period. That period extends from the beginning of the sixth century to the close of the fifteenth. A simple glance at its history will suffice to dissipate the illusion, that the Middle Ages were all the work of the Church, or that she worked throughout them comparatively at her ease. Those ages open with the destruction of the Western Roman Empire and the permanent settlement of the Northern Barbarians on its ruins. For all Western Europe the old Græco-Roman civilization is destroyed, save the wrecks preserved by the Church, and some few towns in Italy and Gaul. The old cultivated populations are in great measure

exterminated, and the few that survive have been plundered, impoverished, and for the most part reduced to slavery. Over the vast extent of the once flourishing, wealthy, and highly civilized and Christianized provinces of the Empire, you see nothing but ruined cities, deserted towns and villages, large tracts of once cultivated land becoming wild, a thin population, composed of miserable, trembling slaves, and rude, ignorant, proud, arrogant, and merciless barbarian masters. The churches and religious houses have been demolished or plundered; the schools and institutions of learning, so numerous and so richly endowed under the Empire, have disappeared; the liberal arts are despised and neglected; the domestic arts, except a few, are lost or forgotten; war, pillage, general insecurity, misery, want have loosened all moral restraints, unchained the passions, and given free scope to vice and crime; the clergy are few, poor, illiterate, for their conquerors, as subsequently in Ireland, have left them no means of education, and, besides, they belong for the most part to the conquered races, and are therefore despised. The barbarian conquerors and masters, moreover, are not all even nominally Catholic. Many of them are Arians; more of them are pagans, still adoring their old Scandinavian and Teutonic deities, and looking with proud disdain on the Christian's faith and the Christian's worship. An Arian kingdom has been erected in Northern Africa, another is establishing itself in Northern Italy; what is now Switzerland and Eastern France was subject to the part heretical, part pagan, but wholly savage Burgundians; in the rest of France there are portions of the old Gallo-Roman population that have not yet received the faith, and portions of the old Celtic population who in their dense forests still cherish their ancient Druidism; the barbarian kingdom in Spain has but recently and imperfectly yielded to Catholicity; the British churches have lost their vigor, and are confined to the narrow district of Wales, and through all the rest of Britain paganism is rampant, and the altars smoke with sacrifices to Woden and Thor. Ireland alone, at this period, is a Catholic oasis in the immense desert of heresy and barbaric infidelity. Belgium in part, all Germany, all Northern and all Eastern Europe above the Byzantine empire, are one unbroken Cimmeria of heathenism; and even Rome herself is not all Catholic, nor even all Christian. Such is a birdseye view of what is now the most civilized and the ruling part of the globe, at the opening of the Middle Ages; and such, after having once Christianized the Empire,

was the new world committed to the charge of the Church. Far more disheartening were her prospects than when she concealed herself in the catacombs, or bled under Nero, Decius, Maximian, and Diocletian ; and far more laborious was the task now before her, than that which she had accomplished in passing from that "upper room" in Jerusalem to the throne of the Cæsars.

Nor was it only at the beginning of the Middle Ages that the Church found herself in face of a hostile world. The hostility continued till the close of the period, and even then did not cease, but broke out under a new form, that of Protestantism, with undiminished virulence. It was in the Middle Ages, we must remember, that Mahometanism sprang up in the desert, and, breaking forth with wild and ferocious fanaticism for eight hundred years, devastated the fairest and most fertile regions of the earth ; that the Iconoclasts persecuted the Church and sought to prepare it for Islamism ; the Greek schism originated and was consummated ; the Huns made their new invasion from the East ; the Saracens ravaged the South of Italy and France, and established themselves in Spain ; the fierce and shaggy Norsemen came down from the frozen North, with their wild courage, their savage cruelty, and their Scandinavian superstitions ; the dissolute Albigenses renewed the heresy of Manes, and perpetrated their horrors ; the Beghards, Wicliffites, followers of the *Evangile Eternelle*, and other sectaries, arose, and by their pantheistic and socialistic movements and insurrections in England, France, and the Low Countries, preluded not unworthily the pantheistic and socialistic revolutions which we have seen, during the last year, convulse all Europe, and threaten the destruction of all law, all order, all society, both civil and religious. Add to these great facts, the deplorable effects of which are still widely and deeply felt, that during these same ages there was scarcely a moment of peace between the civil and the ecclesiastical powers. The civil authority never ceased to encroach on the spiritual, and the Church was obliged to maintain a constant and severe struggle to prevent herself from being swamped, so to speak, by the state, as the schismatical and heretical churches of England, Russia, Scandinavia, and Northern Germany have been and now are. In order to protect society and herself against armed heathenism, Mahometanism, and barbarism, the Church was obliged to revive, or suffer to be revived, in Charlemagne, the Western Roman Empire, before Europe was prepared for it ; and ever after she was but too

happy when in his successors she did not find, instead of a protector, a cruel, oppressive, and sacrilegious spoiler. It is easy now to say, that the revival of the Empire was premature and bad policy ; but it was the best thing possible at the time, or, if it was not, it was inevitable so far as the Church was concerned, and she could not have prevented it if she had tried. Pious as Charlemagne was, he never suffered religion to interfere with his ambition, or the Church to stand in the way of realizing his projects of temporal aggrandizement. The Empire once reëstablished, barbaric as it necessarily was, a formidable schism between the temporal authority and the spiritual commenced, which continued to widen as long as the Empire existed. Rarely was there a "Kaisar" of "the Holy Roman Empire," from Charlemagne to Charles the Fifth, that respected the freedom of the Church, that allowed her to exercise her spiritual discipline without his interference, that permitted her without restraint to manage her own affairs, or that did not wage open or secret war against her. Rarely did the Church, in her struggles for religious liberty against the temporal powers, come off victorious ; never was she able, through the whole period of the Middle Ages, to gain, and never yet has she gained, in even a single Catholic state, the freedom and independence she enjoys here in these United States, which is all she asks, and all she has ever struggled for. The very instance of Philip the Fair of France insulting Boniface the Eighth, and successfully braving his authority, cited by the writer in the *Examiner* to prove the "enormous power of the Popes," is a striking proof of their weakness, and of how completely they lay at the mercy of the crowned despots and tyrants. The sainted Hildebrand, the seventh Gregory, one of the most powerful of the successors of St. Peter, was driven from his throne by the temporal authority, and died in exile. We all know that the rivalries and machinations of the temporal powers effected and sustained the great and scandalous schism of the West, which the Church could never have survived if she had not been upheld by the arm of the Almighty. It is all a delusion, the notion which some seem to cherish, that the Church met no resistance in the Middle Ages, and that emperors, kings, princes, and nobles demeaned themselves as her obedient sons. Their submission was the exception, not the rule, and their protection of the Church was seldom anything but a pretext for enslaving her. They seem never to have responded to her call to execute the sentences she pronounced, unless it suited their humor, flatter-

ed their ambition, or promised them some temporal aggrandizement. They seldom heeded her spiritual censures, or her excommunications, if they persuaded themselves that they could guard against their evil temporal consequences ; and it was rare, indeed, that a prince, even excommunicated and deposed, could not command the support of his army, of the greater part of his own subjects, and even of the national clergy. Godfrey of Bouillon, subsequently the pious Crusader, fights for Henry of Germany after the Pope has deposed him, against his competitor Rudolph, sustained by the Church. If the barons of England desert John Lackland, it is for reasons of their own, not because he is under excommunication ; and a few years after, they can conspire against him at Runnymede, under the lead of Archbishop Langton, in defiance of the excommunication pronounced by the Pope against them.

Nothing is more evident to every one who has studied them without being captivated by their romance, or blinded by his hatred of Catholicity, than that the Church was by no means the only force at work in the Middle Ages, and that she was far enough from being able to carry out into practical life all her own views, and of having everything to her own liking. She had by no means a "thousand years' of almost triumphant ascendancy for the full trial of experiments," as our Unitarian friend rashly asserts. She was resisted on every side ; her rights were perpetually invaded ; her authority was continually braved ; her discipline was seldom suffered to have free course ; her clergy, when they did not add the feudal to their ecclesiastical character, and become princes and barons as well as priests, were treated by the representatives of the barbarian conquerors with contumely and contempt ; and her doctrines, her precepts, her admonitions, were scorned or set at naught by the great whenever it suited their humor or their passions. The Church became the possessor of great riches, it is true ; but her wealth bore witness full as much to the vices, the crimes, and the disorders as to the piety and zeal of the times, and, moreover, she possessed them, in no small part, simply in her accidental character of the public almoner. The donations and bequests she received were not seldom made by a tardy and doubtful repentance, in the hope, we fear often vain, of purchasing repose for the soul of a sinner whose life had been spent in breaking every precept of the Decalogue. The "baron bold" of romantic poetry was not unfrequently a bold blasphemer, a dissolute and sacrilegious wretch, an oppressor of his people,

measuring his rights only by his might. We are not insensible to the charms which romance lends to the Middle Ages, or to the golden hues which a rich and fervid imagination spreads over them when contemplating them at a distance, or in brilliant lamp-light; but whoever has ventured to look at them, stripped of all the deceptive coloring of his own fancy, in their nakedness, as they actually were, will quickly dismiss the pleasing illusion that they were in any peculiar sense "ages of faith," or that it is from them that we are to form any adequate notions of what are really *Mores Catholici*, or Catholic morals and manners. Not in them, indeed, had our good Mother the fair field and the fitting opportunity to realize her idea of Catholic secular life. Faith there was, and piety, and charity, and heroic sanctity, such as has never been surpassed, and the blessed fruits of which we and all modern civilized nations are now reaping; but alas! something else was there too,—something which did not proceed from the Church, which she did not sanction, which she never ceased to oppose, but which resisted all her supernatural efforts, and continued to exist in spite of her.

Undoubtedly, it will not answer to recognize in modern society only the human element, and to attempt to explain all its phenomena from the point of view of simple human activity. In no age, certainly in no age since the advent of our Lord, is it true to say that all in human history is the product of man alone. The Christian religion, the Catholic Church, has placed in the modern world a divine element, supernatural in its source, in its principle, in the mode of its operation, and in its effects. This element was in the Middle Ages, represented there by the Catholic Church; and all the phenomena or historical facts of those, as of all other ages, which proceeded from her, or have received her sanction, we as Catholics are bound to maintain, and are ready to maintain, against all challengers, to be just, right, pure, holy, and salutary to the life of society and of the individual soul. But if we are bound to recognize the part of the Church, we are equally bound to recognize the part of man. Because we recognize the Church in the Dark Ages, it must not be supposed that we recognize only her, and hold her, or concede that she is to be held, responsible for all the phenomena we meet in their history. She never subsists alone, and neither in society nor in the individual, in professedly Catholic states nor in professedly Catholic men, is she the only efficient cause or opera-

tive force. In the individual believer, human nature remains after regeneration ; the flesh survives, and, as long as we live, lusteth against the spirit, making the Christian's life, whatever its interior peace or consolation, one unremitting warfare, from which there is no escape. This, since true of the individual, must also be true of society. In every society, large or small, by the side of the Church subsists fallen human nature, with its evil concupiscence, its grovelling propensities, its disorderly affections, its fierce and ungovernable passions. It will not answer to overlook the facts which have their origin in this source, nor will it answer to charge them to the account of the Church. Both elements coexist, both have their respective phenomena which are intermingled and grow together in history, as grow together the wheat and the tares in the same field. In forming our judgment we must discriminate between them ; and if we do this, and assign to each element its own phenomena, or the class of facts of which it is the principle, we shall have no difficulty in granting all that the most unscrupulous of the enemies of Catholicity allege against the Middle Ages themselves, and yet maintaining the claims of the Church as the infallible Church of God.

The discrimination we here insist on, all Catholic writers, Digby among the rest, no doubt, silently intend, and suppose they never fail to imply ; but when writing with reference to those who are out of the Church, and who therefore have an interest in overlooking it, they seem to us not to make it as clear, as express, as prominent, as its importance demands. Thus Digby, who certainly would, if called upon, admit its propriety and even its necessity, — wishing to present a popular argument for the Church, addressed to the emotions and the affections rather than to the pure intellect, and unhappily consulting the tastes, prejudices, and tendencies of the Puseyitish class of his former Anglican friends, as if they were the fair representatives of the uncatholic world, at least of the Protestant portion of it, — passes it over as if it were a matter of sheer indifference ; and assuming, or appearing to assume, that all was substantially Catholic in mediæval times, — that society was then in its normal state, — that the Church found herself in the midst of a civilization, surrounded by a secular order, precisely to her mind, — that there was nothing in the measures she adopted, the policy she pursued, the institutions she cherished, designed simply to meet an exceptional state, to provide for accidental wants or temporary exigencies, and

which, under other circumstances, would be neither necessary nor desirable, — looks at everything through the Claude Lorraine glass of his own sunny imagination, sees everything *colour de rose*, and writes as if the human element — then, as ever, but too active — had been wholly suppressed, and as if the Church had supernaturalized the whole secular order, and made it one with herself by infusing into it her own divine and supernatural life. Our Unitarian friend, wishing to obtain an argument against Catholicity, is delighted to find this conceded to his purpose, assumes as unquestioned the exclusive ascendancy of the Church, makes no discrimination between the phenomena which are really hers and those which are really not hers, and, fixing his eyes solely either on facts which have the corrupt human element for their principle, or on measures which, though adopted or approved by the Church, have their reason and justification in the exceptional secular order of the times introduced by the barbarian conquest, and not to be brought within the rule except after centuries of painful and often interrupted civilizing labors, he finds enough, and more than enough, that no man of ordinary virtue and intelligence can approve, and which we should be utterly unable to reconcile with the claims of the Church, if we were bound to maintain or to concede that she had in the Middle Ages full power to suppress the lawless workings of our fallen nature, or to shape the entire secular order to her will. Digby, assuming or conceding the exclusive dominion of the Church, finds scarcely a defect in the secular life, as must have been the case if she had in fact had the dominion he concedes ; our Unitarian friend, taking the same exclusive dominion for granted, from the manifest defects of the secular life concludes the defects of the religious life, — that the Church must herself have been defective, barbarian, and superstitious, — as concluded Machiavelli and Rousseau, and as conclude all our modern Socialists ; — falling thus into a monstrous error, which we should suppose the age, if its boasted intelligence had the least foundation in fact, could easily escape.

Making the proper discrimination, we as Catholics can judge the Middle Ages with as much freedom as can they who are not Catholics, or as we ourselves can judge pagan Greece or Rome, Egypt or Syria, India or China, or modern Mahometan and Protestant nations themselves. Of their aggregate phenomena, the Church is undoubtedly responsible for that portion of which she is the principle, or which she has expressly or

tacitly sanctioned ; but these are all good, and, reference had to time and circumstance, the severest critic, unless he sets all reason and common sense at defiance, cannot bring even the shadow of a reproach against them, as Digby's work itself proves, and as many of the adversaries of the Church admit, and have admitted over and over again. As to the remaining phenomena or historical facts, those which did not proceed from the Church, but depended on causes and influences hostile to her, and against which she never for one moment ceased to struggle, we have no responsibility, and feel in them no special interest. Our Church is not implicated in them, for she neither produced nor approved them, and was indeed no slight sufferer from them ; she is not answerable for not having prevented or suppressed them, for she can govern men, collectively or individually, only by moral power, through reason, conscience, and free will. The Divinity of our Saviour was not implicated in the treachery of Judas Iscariot, nor were the truth and sanctity of his religion rendered questionable by the fact, that, when he was arrested and brought before the Roman governor, his disciples all forsook him, and Peter thrice denied him. The moral disorder and wickedness of the world furnish no argument against Divine Providence, — in no sense impugn the goodness of God, or the wisdom or the power of his government ; because he has made man a free agent, governs him by the law of freedom, not by the law of necessity, and does and will do no violence to his free will. The Church, as the representative of God on earth, can govern only as he governs, and is, therefore, restricted to a moral dominion over men. She cannot coerce them into sanctity ; she cannot force them against their wills to receive her sacraments, and it would avail nothing if she could ; for although they do not depend on the recipient for their efficient power, they can produce their sanctifying effect only when he interposes no obstacle to their operation ; and an obstacle he does interpose when his will is against them, or, if old enough to have a will, is not for them.

There is an inexcusable want of science, as well as gross injustice, in holding the Church responsible for the conduct of those members of her external communion who disobey her instructions, and will not comport themselves as her faithful and dutiful children. Science traces effects to their cause, and classifies phenomena according to their principle. It is not science, but nescience, to ascribe to the Church phenom-

ena which, though found intermingled with hers, she has not produced, and which are repugnant to her. Our modern travellers, who have so much to say of the ignorance and corruption they meet or pretend they meet with in Catholic countries, would do well to bear this in mind. The individuals they hold up as exhibiting the fruits of Catholicity are precisely those who do not exhibit them, — are precisely those who neglect the teaching and break the precepts of the Church. The practical effects of any religion must be judged of from the uniform characters of those who sincerely and faithfully practise it, not from the characters of those who do not. Whoever would look for the fruits of Catholicity must look for them in her obedient children, who believe what she teaches and do what she commands. The moral and religious worth of these no sane man can really question. The rule which we adopt in reference to Catholic individuals we must adopt in judging of Catholic nations and Catholic ages. The glory of the Church is not tarnished by human depravity, even though it is found in persons attached to her external communion. Let this be always borne in mind, as well when we judge the Middle Ages as when we judge the Christian ages which preceded or which have followed them. The glory of the Church in the Middle Ages is, not that there was then no human depravity, no injustice, no ignorance, no superstition, no violence, no barbarism, but that she was able to resist the hostile influences to which she was exposed, to preserve herself from becoming ignorant, superstitious, violent, or barbarous, and that, by unwearied effort and constant struggle, she was able gradually to get the better of those hostile influences, to subdue the barbarism, to restore social order, and to recover civilization, to place it on a solid and imperishable basis, and to provide for its future advancement. Here is her glory under the secular point of view. The darker the colors in which you paint those ages, the grosser and more revolting you prove their barbarism to have been, the more do you enhance her merit, the more unequivocal testimony do you bear to the fact that she is God's Church, upheld by his almighty arm, and assisted by his supernatural presence. Had she been human, she would have been carried away by the floods of Northern barbarism and have become herself barbarian; had she been human, had she not been God's Church, she could never have survived the wreck of the old Græco-Roman civilization, but would have been dashed to pieces with

it ; had she been human, had she not been God's Church, she could never have stood firm and immovable as wave after wave of barbarians rolled on and beat with fearful impetuosity against her, — could never have gained an influence over those ferocious hordes, whose sole occupation was war and plunder, penetrated their hearts with some portion of her own light and warmth, infused into their souls sentiments of gentleness, meekness, love, and peace, and raised them to be the foremost nations of the earth. The greater the task she had before her, the greater was her need of Divine assistance, and the greater her glory in having accomplished it.

We may, perhaps, find here one of the reasons why Catholics, who have from earliest infancy been reared in the bosom of the Church, appear so indifferent to mediæval history, and show so little solicitude to prove, that, on its secular side, it was not as dark and forbidding as Protestants heretofore have been accustomed to represent it. They have, in fact, no special interest in vindicating it. They seek their Lord, not in the dead past, but in the living present, — in the Church that is, and is to be until the consummation of the world, unvaried and invariable ; and they may well leave the history of their antiquity, save so far as necessary to repel charges preferred against the Church, to those outside of her communion. Hence, the attempted rehabilitation of mediæval society in our days is the work of Protestants ; the Romantic School is of Protestant German origin ; the greater part of the recent historical works, many of them really able and learned, which have refuted the stale charges against the Popes and the Church in the Middle Ages, are nearly all from Protestant, at least uncatholic, authors ; and the mania which rages for reviving mediæval arts, tastes, usages, and institutions chiefly affects Oxford men and their friends, disturbing the equilibrium of comparatively few Catholics. It is an admirable economy, that they who see that their Church is a mere corpse should seek to dress her in the robes of the past, instead of those of the present. It spares the living and does no harm to the dead. Indeed, we are expecting the assailants of the Church to shift, ere long, their position, and to attempt to rob her of the glory of having subdued the barbarians and founded modern civilization, by stoutly maintaining that there were no barbarians to subdue ; that the Goths, Vandals, Huns, Franks, Burgundians, Longobards, &c., were highly cultivated and polished tribes, far in advance of the degenerate races they invaded and supplanted ; that the Middle

Ages were admirable for their successful and complete realization of the loftiest and most perfect civilization ; and that we poor Romanists fail to be Catholic, because we fail to be sufficiently mediæval ! We are looking for books and pamphlets intended to prove that the grand error of the Popes, their grand apostasy, which caused and justified the Reformation, consisted in their regarding the invaders and destroyers of the Roman Empire as barbarians, in resisting their advanced civilization, and laboring to impose upon them the inferior and effete civilization of Greece and Rome. Nay, we already see evident indications that we are soon to be subjected to this new line of attack ; and in more than one Puseyite publication we detect the germs of the view we here suggest, and which the Romanists seem to us to be pledged by their fundamental principles to develop and mature.

It does not enter into our present purpose to discuss at length the actual character of the Dark Ages on their purely human and secular side. As far as the Church was implicated in their phenomena, we accept them and glory in them ; but as it regards all lying beyond, we feel comparatively indifferent. Under the point of view of humanity, it matters little to us, as Catholics, how dark, how superstitious, how turbulent, violent, or barbarous they were. Certainly we do not believe, and it will take much to persuade us, that they were truly civilized ages, either when compared with the present or when compared with classic antiquity. *Civilization* is a word, no doubt, not easy to define, and different persons may define it differently ; but as we define it, the Middle Ages, aside from what they owed to the Church, were barbarous ages. We take the word in what we suppose to be its ordinary sense, as designating the exterior and interior life of a cultivated and polished people, having a fixed residence, and living under the empire of law, as distinguished from the empire of mere arbitrary will ; and making abstraction of religion and what is derived from it, our standard of civilization is that of ancient Greece and Rome, combining the *νόμος* of the former with the *jus* of the latter. Here, we frankly confess, we are Græco-Roman, and to us all tribes and nations are barbarian just in proportion as they recede from the Græco-Roman standard. We do not assert, we do not pretend, that, prior to Greece and Rome, no people had been truly civilized ; we raise here no question as to whether the Græco-Roman civilization was indigenous or whether it was borrowed ; we simply assert that the civilization of Greece and

Rome, at their most flourishing period, under the purely human point of view, is the standard civilization of history and of human philosophy. Nowhere else does history show us man receiving, under all the aspects of his nature, so high, so thorough, so symmetrical, and so masculine a cultivation as under this wonderful civilization. Græco-Roman art embodies the highest ideal truth conceivable without the Christian revelation. The Phidian Jove embodies the highest ideal, not indeed of the Divinity, but of the full-grown man, without Christianity, in the order of nature. Eliminate from the Græco-Roman civilization all that it contains which depends on its false religion, or on its corruptions or misapplication of the principles of the primitive revelation in the sphere of the supernatural, add the Christian religion, and animate it with the Christian spirit, the Christian's faith, and the Christian's love, and you have a civilization beyond which there is nothing to seek.

Tried by this standard, under the secular and human aspect of civilization, the Middle Ages cannot stand the test. The tribes which overthrew the old Western Roman Empire were barbarians, and inflicted on civilization what, had it not been for the Church, would have been an irreparable evil, of the magnitude of which, confining our views to man merely as a social being and an inhabitant of this earth, we are utterly unable to form any adequate conception. The downfall of ancient Rome and its civilization stands alone in history, and we seek in vain for the record of an event analogous to it. Even external nature, if we may believe the accounts transmitted to us, felt the shock, and the seasons became inclement as society became barbarous. The changes in the natural world in parts of Italy, Gaul, and Britain seem to have been hardly less terrific than those of the political and social world. The downfall of Rome was also a terrible calamity to religion. It undid in a moment the labors of ages, and for long centuries crippled the missionary enterprises of the Church, repressed her expansive energies, and imposed upon her the immense labors — not yet completed — of re-civilizing mankind, and of restoring civilization to the height it had previously attained, or at least to the height at which she found it, when, emerging from the catacombs, she assumed, in the person of Constantine the Great, the imperial purple, and encircled her brows with the imperial diadem.

Nor let it be supposed that these labors of re-civilizing the world were not demanded by the spiritual order. We know

our Church is catholic ; we know that she can reach the heart of the barbarian or the savage, as well as of the civilized man, and can infuse into him her holy faith, her purifying and her sanctifying grace ; but it is nevertheless true, that she finds herself at home, in her normal relations to social and secular life, only in the bosom of a high and true civilization. Man was originally constructed, and society was originally organized, with reference to the Catholic Church, and she can find them adapted to her purposes as a social or national religion, only in proportion as she finds them in their normal state. Their normal state is that of civilization. Neither man nor society, as we know from infallible faith, began either in savagism or barbarism. Savagism and barbarism have resulted from the corruptions which supervened as men departed farther and farther from the original seat of the human race, and from the primitive revelation. There must have been, therefore, an original normal civilization. This civilization, probably, at no period has ever wholly ceased to exist, although it may have had its seat now in one nation and now in another. But, however this may be, it is evidently, at their flourishing period, domiciliated in Greece and Rome, and is preserved or reproduced in the Græco-Roman civilization, under its human and secular relations, in its purity and vigor. Being normal, and realizing the original type as far as possible without Christianity, the Church must have an especial affinity for it, and must bear to it a relation perfectly analogous to that which Catholic theology bears to sound philosophy. Where, then, it does not exist, she must seek to introduce it, and where it has fallen into decay or been destroyed, she must seek to restore it ; — not, indeed, as a preparation for the reception of her faith and charity by individuals, — for that would deny her catholicity, — but as the condition of domesticating herself, so to speak, in the country ; of converting or securing the conversion of the nation itself, — baptizing, as it were, its very soil ; of becoming the vivifying sap of all its institutions, and the informing principle of its whole instinctive and unconscious life.

History, as well as speculation, establishes this view. The Church, in converting the Empire, found nothing in the Græco-Roman order of civilization to change, nothing in its essential constitution of the state, nothing in its general economy of life, public or domestic, — in the *res publica* or the *res domestica*, — and very little in the laws themselves. The great body of the civil law, still the public law of all Catholic, and, to a great extent,

of some Protestant states, existed and was in force before the introduction of Christianity. The changes required were, for the most part, purely spiritual, such as conversion of itself effected, or as the Church, in the discharge of her purely spiritual functions, could herself effect, without the aid of the civil power. What we mean is, that there was nothing in the order of the civilization that constrained her; and after the law had recognized her and ceased to enjoin paganism, she had no other obstacles to contend against than those which human depravity in individuals always and everywhere interposes to her operations. On the other hand, though the Church has certainly converted innumerable individuals who were strangers to the Græco-Roman civilization, we can call to mind, at this moment, no nation which had not originally received that order of civilization or has not subsequently been subjected to it, at least in its essential principles, that has ever accepted, or, if it has at one time accepted, has for more than a brief period retained, the Catholic faith. When the barbarians invaded the Empire, the limits of the Macedonian and Roman conquests were very nearly those of Christendom. The Church had indeed extended her missions beyond, but they were the mere outposts pushed into the enemy's country, or, as it were, the military occupation of a country whose conquest was not yet completed. Other nations assuredly have been brought within the pale of Christendom, but they have remained within only as the Church has succeeded in civilizing them, — so to speak, Græco-Romanizing them. Wherever the barbaric element has remained predominant in the national life, as in Russia, Scandinavia, Prussia, Saxony, Northern Germany, or where, through exterior or interior causes, it has regained the preponderance, as in England and the once Christianized Oriental nations, the nation has relapsed into heathenism, or fallen off into heresy or schism. In several of the nations which have fallen off from the Church, the old barbaric institutions, traditions, customs, and hereditary hatred of Græco-Roman civilization always survived in the heart of the people, and nourished a schism between its national life and its Christian faith. In nearly all, the barbaric monarchy was retained after the conversion, or subsequently introduced or developed; and between the barbaric monarchy — that is, Oriental despotism, the distinctive principle of which is, that the commonwealth is the private property of the prince, the natural termination of all barbaric chieftainship — and the Græco-Roman polity, whose distinctive principle is that the prince repre-

sents the majesty of the state, — is the first magistrate of the republic, bound to govern according to law, — there is an eternal and irreconcilable hostility, because between them there is all the difference that there is between liberty and slavery. Barbarism is essentially slavery, — or rather slavery is the distinctive principle of barbarism, — and the distinctive principle of Græco-Romanism is liberty. Hence, as the Church always and everywhere presented herself as the uncompromising asserter of liberty, upholding the supremacy of LAW, and declaring it no less binding on princes than on their subjects, on the master than on the servant, barbaric nations and barbaric governments, recognizing no authority but mere will, would not, and as such could not, submit to her spiritual jurisdiction.

With these views of the relations of the Church to civilization, and which it would be easy to confirm by decisions of the Holy See, and by a reference to the history of modern missions in barbarous and savage countries, we can have no disposition to defend the Middle Ages, save in what they owed to the Church, and cannot be expected to sympathize with their sentimental and romantic admirers. Under many relations we believe that, after the tenth century to the middle of the fourteenth, they were far superior to the present, though not under the relations of civilization properly so called. But what they are principally lauded for by our sentimentalists and Romanticists is precisely that in them which was the least in accordance with Catholicity and genuine civilization; for it is what proceeded from their barbaric, not from either their Christian or their Græco-Roman, elements. The revival of Letters in the fifteenth century — that century of wonderful activity and enterprise — was a great event, and its bearing on human culture has hardly been over-estimated; but it came in a shape hostile to the Schoolmen, and even to Catholicity, and it revived to a fearful extent the old Græco-Roman gentilism. Paradoxical as it may seem, in doing this it prepared the way for another revival, which this age witnesses, not less important, and far more dangerous; namely, the revival of barbaric gentilism. The Humanists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries have produced the Romanticists of the nineteenth century. They seized upon the Græco-Roman elements of modern society, sought to render them exclusive, to develop and realize them independently, on the one hand, of the Church, and, on the other, of mediæval barbarism, and they

deprived them of life, and brought forth a dead and petrified classicism, as offensive to good taste as to true piety,—as incapable of aiding the growth of a truly human as of a truly Christian life. The Romanticists revolted at this petrified classicism, and, already gentilized by the old Humanists, had no alternative but to seek a living literature in developing the barbaric elements of the Middle Ages, and realizing them independently of the Greek and Roman elements, and also of Catholicity. This they attempted, and their success would be the restoration, not of cultivated and polished gentilism, but of rude, unpolished, barbaric heathenism, after the Teutonic and Scandinavian modes.

We are not disposed to deny that the Schoolmen were defective in taste. They wrote barbarous Latin, and were seldom good Greek scholars; their humor was grotesque rather than delicate, and their jokes smacked of men who live among themselves, remote from the great world; their forms were dry and rigid, and their rules too narrow and too unelastic for the play of the free spirit and expansive genius of man. The Humanists, in combating them and substituting the purer taste and the more symmetrical and graceful forms of ancient art, did a valuable service to the cause of human culture and refinement. So the Romanticists, in freeing us from the fetters of a dead classicism, from the narrow and pedantic rules of men who servilely copied the exterior forms, but were incapable of producing in the free and original spirit, of the ancient classics, and permitting us to move more at our ease, according to our natural dispositions, have served the cause of good literature. By their excavations of mediæval romance from the tombs of centuries, and their importations from the old mystic East, they have enlarged our literary horizon and augmented our literary materials, for which we cheerfully render them all fitting acknowledgment. But as the Humanists, along with their classicism, revived old gentile theories and speculations, by which they ruined philosophy and shook the faith of no small part of Christendom while professing to labor to confirm it, so the Romanticists, to the extent of their influence, must revive the old barbaric heathenism, and tend to ruin literature, art, philosophy, and through them both religion and civilization. The Humanists gave us heathenism, but it was cultivated heathenism, which, as to its forms, was repugnant neither to good taste nor to Christianity; the Romanticists, the Humanists of our time, give

us heathenism to an equal extent, and what is worse, rude, uncouth, barbaric heathenism, with its grotesque images, its gigantic figures, its huge disproportioned shapes, its hideous and grinning monsters, which no Christian art can baptize, no power can lick into a Christian shape, inform with a Christian soul, or train to a civilized behaviour. Do the best possible, it will always remain the man-bear of recent German romance.

Nothing would be more amusing, if the matter were not so grave, than to see our Romanticists parading the old mediæval romances, chronicles, ballads, lays, and roundelays, as genuine specimens of Christian literature. Indeed, the irony is too obvious to be witty. Even if sometimes the thought and sentiment happen to be Christian, the form is barbarian. The mediæval romancers frequently profane Christian thoughts and expressions, as the old magicians profaned the Sacred Host in their spells; but the substance of their works is always derived from heathen sources. The Troubadours of Provence are moved by their own corrupt passions, and sing under Arabic, Moorish, and Manichæan influences; the Trouvères of Normandy, the bards of Armorica and Wales, the Minnesingers of Germany, recite or sing, for the most part, the old barbaric and heathen memories and superstitions of their respective nations, which long survived, and are not even yet wholly extinct, in the heart of the old Celtic, Scandinavian, and Teutonic families. To call the mediæval literature proceeding from these sources Christian is only to prove how far we have lost, or never received, the true conception of Christianity. In admiring such a literature, we give no evidence of a return towards Catholicity; we only show that we are doing our best to return to the state of the barbaric nations before the Church had commenced the work of their conversion, and are trying to satisfy our souls with mere vagaries, or to enrich ourselves with the *débris* of old barbaric nationalities, idolatries, and superstitions.

As to the Middle Ages themselves, we conclude, with an Italian writer, that "they are admirable for their Christian genius, and the nations then, so far as they were animated by the Catholic idea, undoubtedly far surpassed the most cultivated people of gentile antiquity; but except that which they derived, in effect, from religion, we know not what there is in their annals to be admired, and the modern encomiasts of feudalism, chivalry, Gothic architecture, &c., appear to us lit-

the reasonable and very dull." In all those lofty qualities of the civilized man, in themselves indifferent to vice or virtue, the man of mediæval history appears to us far inferior to the man of Greek and Roman antiquity. Compared with the latter, he seems to us a mere dwarf, stunted and warped in his growth by a one-sided and incomplete culture. We find in the mediæval man, the moment he steps out of religion, very little of that simplicity, naturalness, repose, sustained courage, prudent energy, sedate strength, greatness of soul, constancy of will, firmness of resolution, or force of character, which so strikes and charms us in the men of classic antiquity. There is, as Gioberti — a writer whom we like for some things, and dislike for many — has well suggested, a considerable distance between the men of Plutarch and Livy, and the romantic heroes and lion-hearted warriors of Boiardo and Ariosto, with their mad adventures and their silly love-makings.

The causes of this inferiority of the mediæval man, and perhaps equally of the man of our times, we have no space to consider now at length. The remote cause of it lies, no doubt, in the depravity of human nature, in consequence of which men will do a thousand times more to improve themselves and society for the sake of self, or of worldly or human greatness, than they will for the sake of God, or at the command of duty. Hence, in a certain sense, all those religions which are the most consonant to corrupt human nature, and give the largest scope to selfish and worldly motives, will always, for a time at least, be more favorable to the growth of the qualities we have named than Christianity itself. Hence we should look for more striking manifestations of them under paganism, Mahometanism, Protestantism, or modern Radicalism, than under Catholicity; for these impose fewer restraints on our motives of action. Christianity, if there is any truth in what we have said in the course of this article, demands, along with her supernatural virtues, the highest human excellence, because she demands for her permanent home in a nation, and her free and regular action on the mass of the people, the highest and truest civilization. But she cannot encourage the cultivation of human greatness for the sake of self, society, or the world; for though she recognizes and uses these as means, she will never suffer them to be sought as ends. Here is her glory, her strength, and at the same time her weakness. Paganism could suffer us to cultivate and perfect our natures for their own sake, and permit us to pro-

pose human greatness as our end. Protestantism virtually, if not avowedly, does the same. The Church not only tolerates, but seeks, the improvement of society, its progress and perfection, yet only for the sake of the purposes of our present existence, and as facilitating the operation of the means of securing eternal life. Radicalism or Socialism disdains to look so high or so far, and is content to propose the progress and perfection of society for its own sake. As the motives paganism, Protestantism, and Radicalism propose or tolerate are those which are the most agreeable to fallen nature, we can easily understand that, for a time, their adherents should be more remarkable for the qualities we have pointed out than the great body of Catholics, who can cultivate them only from purer, loftier, and more distant motives, therefore motives less powerful for a depraved will and a corrupt concupiscence. Here, undoubtedly, is the real cause of the inferiority of the modern to the ancient man, — an inferiority which results from his actual moral and religious superiority.

Though the remote cause is in the corruption of human nature, and the fact that paganism imposed less restraint on its operations than Catholicity, the proximate cause of this inferiority is in the schism which has always existed, since the institution of the Church, between the secular and the spiritual elements of society. The secular element has never been brought into harmony with the spiritual. The Church could not do it at first, because the state was pagan, and persecuted her; and it took her full three hundred years to convert it. But she had no sooner converted it, than the barbarians began their invasion, and she had to commence her struggle against barbarism, which, in part, still continues. She has never been able to baptize secular life, and to institute a culture as perfect for it as that which she has always sustained is for the religious life. The secular order has therefore, from the first, remained outside of Christianity, and the secular mind has never been informed with the Christian spirit. The spirit of all secular art, secular literature, secular science, even when cultivated by Catholics, is and always has been, from Nero to Mazzini, unchristian. This is obvious to every one. Whenever we leave the religious order, escape its external control, and abandon ourselves instinctively to secular pursuits, or in any degree yield to the spirit of the secular order, however pure our intentions in the outset, however firm our faith, sincere and earnest our attachment to our religion,

we are imperceptibly borne away in a direction hostile to Christianity, and, ere we suspect danger, are sunk in the quicksands of vice or dashed against the rocks of heresy or infidelity. We have a striking proof of this in Lamennais, another in Padre Ventura, and still another, we fear, in Gioberti, — three of the greatest, and, in various ways, most extraordinary men of our times. All three set out sincere, earnest, and enlightened Catholic priests, with rare philosophical genius and attainments, and rarer knowledge of the spirit and tendencies of the age. Lamennais has fallen to the lowest depths ; Ventura has, by his recent conduct at Rome, outraged the feelings of the whole Catholic world ; and Gioberti, as his case now stands, or as it is known to us, we must regard as having betrayed his religion and forfeited all his claims upon sincere Catholics. What can more clearly prove that the secular order remains even to this day unbaptized, and that whoever follows its spirit is sure to find himself on the side against the religion of God ?

Our modern literature is all full of this schism between the two orders, and the secret of most of the movements of our times is the effort to heal it. From Pusey to Parker, Ventura to Proudhon, the Hegelians to the Fourierists and Icarians, the harmony of the two orders is the secret, in general the avowed, object. But, unhappily, nearly all efforts not only fail, but tend to widen the breach ; because they are efforts to heal the schism by harmonizing the spiritual with the secular, instead of the secular with the spiritual. Here is the grand difficulty. As friends of religion, we are obliged to hold on, in most countries, to things as they are, — to desist from efforts to effect such educational improvements and social ameliorations as are good in themselves, such as are really needed, and such as we are most anxious to effect, — because we cannot, in the present state of the world, make a single move in their behalf, without throwing the power into the hands of the men who would subject the spiritual order to the secular, destroy the whole influence of religion, and with it the very conditions of civilization. The certain evil that would follow would infinitely outweigh the good we could effect. If any one doubts it, he has but to meditate on the exile of the Holy Father at Gaëta, and consider what during the last year has taken place at Rome. The Holy Father attempted wise and judicious reforms in his states, and, in consequence, was driven from his throne, not by the men opposed to them, but by the very men who clamored for them, who feasted him a whole year for them, and in whose

favor they were more especially effected. The very attempt on his part to ameliorate the temporal order drove him into exile, and gave up his dominions to as miserable a set of infidel vagabonds, as cowardly a set of miscreants, as the sweepings of all Italy could furnish. If the men who so clamor for reform, and so strenuously urge the amelioration of the secular order, would lay aside their hostility to religion, and consent to work with the Church, under her spiritual guidance, she would soon, through them, effect all needed ameliorations, establish a true system of secular culture, effect a new civilization, which would give us tempered together in one, as Gioberti demands, the full-grown Christian and the full-grown man, as much superior to the ancient Græco-Roman civilization as the morals of Christianity are superior to those of paganism. But the thing is not possible so long as they are able, and continue, to keep the secular order armed to the teeth against her. But as human depravity will last as long as the world stands, the schism between the two orders will probably never be entirely healed, and the glorious results for civilization, so easy to effect if men were only reasonable, or not madmen or fools, will probably remain for ever without being fully attained. All we can do is to be faithful to the spiritual order, and to labor diligently to realize them as far as possible, — not for the sake of the temporal good to be secured, but for the sake of the purposes of our present existence, and the free and unimpeded action of the Church in preparing men for eternal life.

Our Unitarian friend will find, if he meditates what we have written, his article answered as far as answer it needed. We have not followed him step by step, nor was it necessary ; we suppose him capable of applying principles, when they are furnished to his hand, without our applying them for him. He will see that we rely no more than he does on poetry and romance as evidence of the truth of religion. To some minds they may be occasions of conversion, and they were in some respects so in our own case, dry logic-grinder as many people suppose us to be, for they removed certain obstructions there were to the operation of the grace of God on our heart ; but causes or grounds of conviction they never were, and never can be. Christian art has its uses, and important uses they are, too. Persons of a certain temper may be led by it to reflect on the claims of the Church, or it may soften their feelings and subdue for the moment their prejudices, and prepare them to listen to her claims. So far, it contributes, and legitimately, to conver-

sions ; but as an argument addressed to the reason, or as a motive of credibility, it is of no value, for it may well be questioned if Christian art, as pure art, has ever surpassed, or even equalled, pagan art.

We recognize no Church of the Middle Ages ; but the Church in the Middle Ages, as in all ages, our Unitarian friend will see, we hold to be irreproachable, not, indeed, because we are a great admirer of those ages themselves, nor because we believe they were themselves irreproachable, but because what there was in them objectionable proceeded from causes independent of the Church and hostile to her, which she had no power to control, and could remove only in proportion as she could induce men to become voluntarily her subjects. There were, doubtless, things which she did then that she would not do now ; for the circumstances now are different, and do not demand, might not even justify, them. She is in the world to bless it ; and while her doctrines and principles remain eternally unvaried and invariable, she applies them with perfect freedom to the circumstances of time and place. She never permits herself to become the slave of routine or of stereotyped modes of exterior action. When society is in an exceptional state, she deals with it accordingly. When it throws upon her the burden of providing for the poor, she does it in the best manner existing circumstances allow. We rejoice when we read that seventeen thousand poor were fed in one day at Cluny, and we see in the fact her maternal solicitude and forethought for even the temporal subsistence of her children ; but we see no evidence in it of the perfection of the secular order of the time, and no reason for wishing to perpetuate a state of society that leaves such a number of poor daily to be fed at a single monastery. Many of the institutions which the Church founded and cherished in the Middle Ages have passed away, or must pass away, with the social changes which are constantly taking place ; but this is no cause of reproach to her, or of alarm to us. Others, better adapted to the altered circumstances of new ages, she will institute in their place, and gain the same ends by other means. And thus it is, that, while we adhere to the Church in all times, and *because* we do so, we are free to condemn barbarism wherever we find it, and to labor with all our zeal and ability for an advanced, and, if possible, an ever-advancing, civilization.

ART. IV. — *Spirit Sculpture ; or the Year before Confirmation.* By ENNA DUVAL. Philadelphia : James Fullerton. 1849. 24mo. pp. 166.

OUR readers will perhaps remember, that, some time since, we expressed our decided disapprobation of the greater part of modern novels, and especially of a certain class of so-called Catholic novels, with which, for a moment, it seemed that our community was to be inundated. Our censures were far from being received in the spirit in which they were offered ; and we were charged with being invidious, one-sided, bigoted, and ultra-Catholic, — though what *ultra-Catholic* means, or what sort of an animal it is, we are sure, is more than we know. The Catholic authors censured appear to have taken it for granted that we intended to condemn all works which make use of fiction as a medium of amusement or instruction ; and one gentleman, who had written the longest and heaviest, if not the best, novel of the class specially disapproved, opened a fire upon us in the newspapers, applied to us sundry uncouth epithets, and proved to his own satisfaction, we presume, that we were certainly erroneous, if not, indeed, heretical ; for Nathan the Prophet used allegory, and our Lord himself spake in parables ! It is true, we limited our censures to a special class of works ; it is true, also, that, while we censured that class, we praised another class, in which fiction is employed with great effect as a medium both of instruction and amusement ; but that counted for nothing, for readers who are one-sided, and averse to “ nice distinctions,” are pretty sure to suppose that authors must be as narrow and indiscriminating as themselves.

It is no easy matter to set the public right, when once it has got a wrong notion concerning your views into its head. It is infallible, and if there has been a blunder, it is, of course, yours, not its. If you finally get it to take in your real meaning, and to understand you correctly, it never conceives that it had misunderstood you, but quietly assumes that you have changed your views, and abandoned your former notions. Nevertheless, on this subject of Catholic novels, we shall try once more to place ourselves before our own public in the light in which we choose to stand, and that ; too, without abandoning the ground we have heretofore assumed.

This is a reading age, and reading of some sort Catholics, as well as others, must and will have. It is idle to suppose that

we can satisfy the reading propensity with polemical or ascetic theology. This may be an evil, but it is one we cannot remove. Perfection in human affairs is not to be expected ; and the greatest fool going is he who imagines himself able to mend all things, and who will tolerate no imperfection. We must do what we can, not always what we would. Religious are always a small minority, the exception rather than the rule ; the great majority are and will be seculars, with secular habits, secular tastes, and secular pursuits. Our chief attention is due to these, and our principal study must be to enable them to live secular lives without forgetting God, or coming short of salvation ; that is, to save men in the world, without compelling them to retire from the world. The religious state is far higher than the secular, and blessed are they who are called to it ; but the secular is not unlawful, and salvation is attainable without forsaking it, and becoming monks, friars, nuns, or sisters.

A slight glance at our Catholic literature — we mean that which is accessible to the mere English student—is sufficient to satisfy us that we have very little literature adapted to seculars, to the great body of the laity living in the world and taking part in its affairs. The religious are amply provided for. Our ascetic literature is rich, varied, and extensive. We have admirable manuals of devotion for all ages and classes, and suitable to all stages and modes of the spiritual life ; we have, too, an abundance of theological works, speculative and practical, dogmatical and polemical ; but we have no secular literature in English. The monastery is richly endowed ; our secular life has nothing but the crumbs that fall from its table, or the soup dealt out at its gate. Secular literature, whether its authors are Catholics or Protestants, breathes, for the most part, an unchristian spirit, and is dangerous to Christian truth and Christian piety. Here is the literary defect we have wished on various occasions to point out, and which we wish our authors to undertake to remedy.

The novels we censured were intended to remedy this defect, — to supply seculars with amusing, interesting, and instructive reading, which should keep their minds free from error, their hearts protected from impure influences, and both in a healthy state, alike compatible with religious duties and worldly avocations. So far as the intention of their authors was concerned, they were admirable ; but in execution they were failures, because they were marked by the schism between the spiritual order and the secular, which characterizes all modern society.

On their religious side they smelt of the schools or the convent ; on their secular side, of unregenerate human nature ; and could as well have been written by pagans, Protestants, or unbelievers, as by Catholics. They lacked unity, failed to temper the two orders together, to blend them in one, or, in other words, to baptize the secular, to infuse into it the Catholic spirit, and yet suffer it to remain secular.

Christianity undoubtedly enjoins self-denial, detachment from society, and contempt of the world ; but morally, not physically. She recognizes and preserves these as physical facts, and the denial enjoined is simply their moral destruction as motives or ends of human activity. Physically considered, they are indispensable. Without the world, there were no society ; without society, no self ; and without self, no subject of the Christian law. Hence Christianity suffers us to do no injury to self, to society, or to the world, but, in fact, commands us always and everywhere to seek their true interest, their greatest good, — only as means, not as ends. The cultivation and perfection of our nature, so dwelt upon by the Goethean school, Christianity cannot, in the sense of that school, tolerate, — that is, for the sake of our nature itself ; but as the means of comprehending and successfully discharging the duties which devolve on our state in life, she makes them morally obligatory on each one of us to the full extent of our ability and opportunity. The amelioration and perfection of society as an end, or for the sake of society itself, Christianity forbids, and therefore forbids us to sympathize with modern Socialists ; but as a means of enabling all to fulfil the great purpose of their present existence, or to provide for the free and regular operation of the means of securing eternal life, the ultimate destiny of man, she enjoins them, and in no degree permits us to neglect them. She certainly bids us remember always the end for which we have been made, and declares every act sinful, or at least destitute of virtue, that is not referred to God as its ultimate end, and therefore recognizes no duties but duties to God ; yet she makes these duties in almost every case *payable* to our neighbour, so that, while their glory redounds to God, their benefit inures solely to man and society.

The principle here involved is universal in its application. In no case does our religion require ontological or physical destruction. Our ascetic writers, indeed, tell us of the necessity of self-denial, self-crucifixion, self-annihilation ; but their sense

is always moral. What is physical or ontological is the work of the Creator, and all his works are good, very good. Physically considered, man's nature has not been essentially altered by the Fall, and is good now as well as when it came from the hands of the Creator. We have not a single appetite, passion, or faculty, which, in its being or essential nature, — not in its exercise or manifestation, — did not belong, and which would not be necessary, to us as human beings in a state of innocence. We did not lose our nature, we did not acquire another nature, by the Fall. By the Fall we lost the supernatural grace and endowments we before had, by which our nature was maintained in its integrity and we were established in justice, and in consequence of the loss of which our nature became turned away from God, so that we are now naturally averse to him, and need to be converted, that is, turned towards him ; but, ontologically considered, taken as pure nature, our nature remained essentially what it had always been, and remains so still, even after conversion or regeneration. Take, for instance, the appetite for food. This appetite belongs to us in a state of innocence precisely as much as in a state of sin. Its satisfaction, that is, the partaking of food, must, then, be a legitimate act ; and it would, as we all know, be a sin to starve ourselves to death. The same is to be said of all our natural appetites. The crucifixion religion enjoins as a duty — we speak not now of voluntary penances and mortifications — is a moral crucifixion. It forbids us to take food for the sake of the sensual gratification it affords. It requires us to eat for the sake of preserving our life and health, and requires us to preserve our life and health, not for their own sake, but for the sake of God. But in eating and drinking for the end here proposed, and as far as requisite to this end, we experience as much sensual delight as they do who eat and drink for the sake of that delight itself, and perhaps more too. Hence our Lord says, “ Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added to you ” ; hence he promises that they who lose their life for his sake shall find it, and they who forsake all for him shall be rewarded a hundred-fold even in this life.

Since, then, the self-denial or self-annihilation is moral, not physical, the destruction of nature, and therefore of the secular order which Christianity enjoins, is their destruction simply as ends or motives of our activity, and therefore a destruction perfectly compatible with their physical existence and prosperity. In the conversion of the individual, grace does not destroy

or supersede nature ; it retains and elevates or supernaturalizes it, by infusing into it a higher principle, and enabling it to act to a higher end, as is inferable from the well-known fact that Christianity does not abrogate the law of nature, but confirms it, and makes it an integral part of her own law. The fault of nature, aside from its inadequacy to the supernatural end to which we are destined, is, that, when left to itself, to act without grace, it acts to a subordinate and selfish end, and by so acting carries us away in a direction contrary to that required by religion. Because this is so with nature, it is so with the secular order. What is wanting, then, is not the destruction of the secular, but the change of the direction of its activity ; so that, though it remains, as it always must, below the spiritual, its heart shall always beat in unison with it, and conspire to the same ultimate end.

What we are here to labor for is to conform the secular to the spiritual, so that we may retain it in its natural sphere, and remain seculars, without ceasing to be good Christians, devout Catholics, — not, indeed, by virtue of the secular, but of the spiritual which transforms it, as in conversion our nature itself is transformed by grace, so that our proper acts have a supernatural character and worth. If we overlook or deny this, we, on the one hand, run into infidelity or license, or, on the other, assert that the monastic life or its equivalent is the only normal Christian life, and that we can lawfully be seculars only by dispensation. Religious who withdraw from the world do so, not because it is unlawful to remain in the world, or because they could not have remained in the world without a dispensation, — not because salvation is not attainable without entering religion, — but because they have a vocation to do more than is enjoined, to fulfil the Counsels as well as the precepts of the Gospel, and to labor, not only to inherit eternal life, but also for perfection. They voluntarily assume obligations beyond the precepts of the law, and bind themselves to penances and mortifications which exceed what the law exacts, and thus place themselves in a state above that in which we are who have taken upon ourselves no obligations but those which the law imposes. They are, no doubt, highly privileged ; but to require all to be like them, or to treat us poor seculars with food prepared only for them, is only converting in effect the Evangelical Counsels into precepts, and making the road to heaven narrower and more difficult than our Lord himself has made it. It would be not baptizing the secular order, and, by infusing into it the Christian

spirit, Christianizing it, but disowning it altogether, and keeping it always outside of Christianity, and therefore hostile to it.

Undoubtedly, the Christian should always and everywhere aspire to the highest ; and he may well fear, if he only aims to get into heaven by the skin of his teeth, that he will not get in at all. Undoubtedly, exhortations and admonitions to aspire to the highest sanctity should be addressed to all men, to seculars as well as to religious, in such form and manner as the pastor and the spiritual director judge best ; but we must deal with the world as we find it, and consult the practicable as well as the desirable. By exacting too much, we may get nothing. The bow over-bent is sure to break. If we furnish to seculars only the spiritual food appropriate to religious, we shall leave them to die of inanition ; for that food the state of their stomachs will not bear. By insisting on a monastic discipline for seculars, we make them rebel against all spiritual discipline, and leave them to the operations of unbaptized nature. Refusing to accept the secular in a subordinate and subservient sphere, we force it, as the condition of its existence, to assert its independence, and to aspire to supremacy. We thus widen the schism between the spiritual order and the secular, which, as we have seen in the foregoing article, is the great evil of all modern society.

The secular order, in its subordinate and subservient sphere, exists by divine right ; and within that sphere we have no more right to labor to destroy it, than we have to labor to destroy the spiritual order itself. We have, on the other hand, no right to assert its independence and supremacy. It has the right to exist as a servant, no right to exist as a master. Here are the two truths which it is always necessary to keep in view. The recognition of the spiritual alone leads, in effect, to the same result as the recognition of the secular alone ; for the secular will always, in spite of us, remain and assert itself ; and when not subject to law, it will assert itself without law, or, if need be, against law. The only way to escape infidelity or licentiousness is, not to demand exclusive spirituality of the mass of mankind, but to accept within its sphere the secular, and, by Christianizing, render it not only innocuous, but even serviceable to religion. We utter nothing new here, and, indeed, only advocate what a class of writers we have for years warred against really have in their minds, if they did but understand themselves. The only difference between them and us is, that they secularize the spiritual, while we would spiritualize the secular ; or

rather, they seek a sort of alliance or compromise between the two orders, while we allow no compromise, and seek to temper together the two orders in the unity of life, as soul and body are united in one living man. They would bring religion down to the secular, and take from the integrity of the spiritual, subtract from its sublimity and universality, while we would leave, as in duty bound, the spiritual in its integrity, its sublimity, and its universality, and simply conform the secular to it without destroying it. It is not that we would have less of the secular than they, but we would have it under more orthodox and Christian conditions.

One of the most powerful instruments of bringing about the unity we contend for is literature, and in this we agree perfectly with the authors of the Catholic novels we have censured. We censured them because they did not furnish the kind of literature we needed. On one side they give us religion, but religion that excludes the secular order; on the other side, they give us the secular order independent of religion. Their religion is for religious, their secularity for the infidel and licentious; and instead of tempering the two orders together by infusing the spiritual into the secular, they only alternately sacrifice one order to the other, now the secular to the spiritual, and now the spiritual to the secular. Here is their defect, a defect which proceeds, not from the intention of their authors, but from the duality which introduces antagonism into their own life, — from the schism which, unsuspected by them, runs through their own interior moral and intellectual world, sundering the two orders, and maintaining them in perpetual hostility one to the other. What we want is a literature which is the exponent of the harmony in the mind and heart of the two orders, which is adapted to the secular in its subordinate and subservient sphere, and which, without any formal dogmatizing or express ascetic dissertations, exhortations, or admonitions, shall excite the secular only under the authority of religion, and move it only in directions that religion approves, or at least does not disapprove.

We are far from pretending that works pertaining to a literature of this sort should supersede dogmatical, controversial, or ascetic works, — that they are works of the highest order, or even works that are always and everywhere needed. We hold, of course, that the religious state is higher than the secular, and that general literature is a temporary and accidental want. But here and now, taking into consideration the

age and country, such works are much needed and would be of very high utility. They would amuse, interest, instruct, cultivate in accordance with truth the mind and the affections, elevate the tone of the community, and, when they did not directly promote virtue, they would still be powerful to preserve and defend innocence, — often a primary duty. They would weed out from the modern world what it still retains of mediæval barbarism, advance true civilization, open to thousands a source of rational enjoyment, and preserve a healthy and vigorous state of the public mind and heart. In a word, they would contribute to what we need, a Christian *secular* culture, perhaps the greatest want of our times, and that which would more than any one thing else — the grace of God supposed — aid, not only in preserving the faith in those who have it, but in winning to it those who now have it not. Purely spiritual culture is amply provided for; but owing to the barbarism of past ages, and the incredulity and license of the last century and the present, secular culture in unison with the Christian spirit is, and ever has been, only partially provided for, and but imperfectly attained. It seems to us that the best way for our Catholic writers — not theologians by profession, and whose works come and must come under the head of general literature — to serve the cause of truth and virtue is to devote themselves, not to controversial or ascetic works, of which we have enough, but to the *Christian secular culture* of the age, or, in a word, to the advancement of Christian civilization. They need not aspire to teach Catholic theology; let it satisfy them to breathe into literature the true Catholic spirit, and, as far as possible, inform the secular world itself with the genuine Christian life.

The field is ample, and genius and talent can never be at a loss for materials. Undoubtedly, the composition of such works as we suggest will require genius, talent, learning, long and patient study, as well as profound and devout meditation; but we cannot understand wherefore that should be an objection. Nothing great or good is ever produced on any other conditions, and what is neither great nor good in its order we do not want; we have enough of scribblers and drivellers. No man should open his mouth in public unless he has something to say, and something, too, which the public ought to hear. We know no necessity there may be that every one who can bring together a mass of high-sounding words, or round or polish a period, should turn author, and send forth, to the great

annoyance of good sense and good taste, his wordy or his polished no-meanings. Many a good man, many a worthy man, who would have made an excellent hodman, shoemaker, or carpenter, has been spoiled by his ambition to be an author, or at least a writer for the newspapers. Alas! the newspapers have much to answer for. Had it not been for them, we ourselves probably should have gone through life a respectable mechanic. Indeed, many of our so called able editors themselves are more at home at the case than at the desk, and far better at clipping than at inditing. Even with good brains, no man can succeed well as an author without discipline, without cultivation. How, then, shall the poor wight succeed who has neither brains nor culture? Let no such wight attempt authorship on either a large or a small scale.

But, nevertheless, let no one despair. Genius and talent are more widely diffused than is commonly pretended. They are both susceptible of growth, and where there is a firm will and a noble purpose, those who promise little in the beginning by persevering effort may finally attain to excellence. All men are born helpless infants, and are subsequently what they are made or make themselves. Bulwer, no great philosopher, but a keen observer, shows in his novels two characters, Alice and Fanny, regarded in childhood as partially idiotic, subsequently expanding under the strong passion of love into not only amiable, but highly intellectual, women. His explanation of the fact we reject, but the fact itself we can believe was taken from actual life. The love did not expand the intellect; it simply concentrated the will, and enabled it to act with firmness and vigor. Feebleness of intellect is usually the effect of feebleness of will. The intellectual faculties are present and good enough in most men, but the will is too weak and inconstant to apply them with the requisite steadiness and perseverance. Whatever strong passion or sentiment, demanding for its gratification the exercise of intellect, possesses a person, tends to strengthen the will, to give it the force and constancy necessary to call into play the intellectual powers which were previously dormant or dissipated by being left to themselves. Alice and Fanny have great susceptibility, great quickness and strength of feeling, but feeble wills. They are infantile, and have no self-subsistence, no force of character, till the powerful passion of love seizes them. Then they suddenly unfold, develop unexpected intellectual power, because then, subjected by an invincible motive, they apply it with intensity,

energy, constancy, and perseverance. The principle is not applicable to the passion of love alone. Men weak and inconstant in all else are often remarkably steady, persevering, and acute in all matters of business. Eminent Saints, estimable for their genius and learning, had been dismissed in youth from school for their incapacity. The love of God became with them a ruling passion, made them strong, energetic, firm, constant, and then they showed to all men that they had no lack of intellect. The same thing is evinced by the fact, that some men write and speak admirably under excitement, who can hardly speak or write at all when unexcited. They do not want intellect, but they want the force of will to use it. Wherever there is a noble purpose, a firm will, a fixed resolution, genius and talent never fail.

The feebleness and frivolousness of modern literature are due to no deterioration of men's intellectual powers, which are as great and as good now as ever they were, but to the want of force and constancy of will, which itself is owing to the neglect of severe studies, the want of true philosophical discipline, and of high and noble aims. We have, in consequence of the ruin of philosophy commenced by Descartes and completed by the modern French and German philosophers, had our minds brought down from the higher order of speculative truth, and turned outward upon merely material and sensible objects, in which there is nothing to demand and nothing to suggest noble aims or lofty purposes. The good the will seeks is low and trifling, and no grand and mighty passion seizes the soul, and concentrates and employs all its energies. Hence we see everywhere weakness and frivolity, imbecility and inconstancy, and hear from the depths of all souls a low wail for something they have not, and which may prove itself adequate to their inborn nobility.

If, then, the order of literature we are contending for does demand genius and talent for its creation, so much the better. It presents a high and noble aim, demands a lofty purpose, and, with a strong will and a firm resolution that shrink from no labor, pause before no obstacle, and only gather force from opposition, we can easily answer to its calls. Nature is kinder to all men than we commonly imagine, and few there are who cannot, with God's blessing, if they strive with a strong and constant will, form their own characters, and attain to more than respectability, if they choose. To will is always in our power, for will is always free. Will strongly, will nobly,

will firmly, will constantly, and fear not but you will execute, in due time, bravely and successfully.

The aim of the literature we demand is not positive or strictly scientific instruction in religion and morals. The purpose is to cultivate the secular element of individual and social life, — to press that element into the service of religion and morality, on the principle that the Church makes use of poetry and music in celebrating her Divine Offices, or art in the construction and decoration of her altars and temples. The great artist, if he is to aid religion, if he is to subserve her influence by removing the obstacles which the flesh interposes, subduing the passions, and setting the affections to the keynote of devotion, must, it is true, understand his religion well, and in some sense be himself eminently religious; he must also, if he would be great even as an artist, whatever the sphere or tendency of his art, be a man of genuine science; for art is the expression of the true under the form of the beautiful, and it is obvious that a man cannot express, under the form of the beautiful, or any other form, what he does not apprehend. Here, perhaps, is the secret of the present low state of art. There is no want of artistic aspiration, skill, or effort, yet throughout the world art languishes, and no great master makes his appearance; because the aspirants do not qualify themselves for success by genuine scientific culture, do not rise to the clear, distinct, and vivid apprehension of the higher order of truth, the eternal verities of things, and there obtain a noble and worthy ideal. The most that art, in our days, can do, is to copy external nature, paint flowers, or babble of brooks, woods, and green fields; for we have no science, no philosophy, and even our faith is languid when it is not wholly extinct, and seizes nothing firmly, vividly. Nevertheless, though the artist must be well instructed, be a great theologian, philosopher, and moralist, his province is not to express truth under the form of science, but, as we have said, under that of the beautiful. In a degree, the province of the literature we are contemplating is and should be the same. Instructive it should be, by all means; but as Beethoven's Symphonies, Haydn's Masses, or Mozart's Requiem are instructive, — instructive by the moral power they excite, the lofty thoughts they suggest, the tone and direction they impart to the whole interior man.

Or, if more direct instruction is aimed at, it should be of that general kind, and in those general departments of knowledge,

which are open to men who may be widely apart as to their special views. The Catholic cultivator of secular literature should, of course, be always governed, influenced, by his religion, and should always take care not to utter a single sentiment not in perfect harmony with his Catholic faith and morals ; but his aim should not be the direct exposition or propagation of his faith, any more than it is when he is cultivating his field, attending to his merchandise, or taking part in the political affairs of his country. He must not affect to be the theological doctor, the missionary, or the spiritual director. He must remember that he is a layman, or at least is to act here as a layman, not as a professional man. He may instruct, but it is with regard to those matters which are properly within the province of laymen. He may even be controversial ; but let the controversy be on matters where he may carry with him the suffrages of all men who recognize the law of nature or the authority of natural reason, — where he may have intelligent and well-disposed men, who are not of his communion, for readers and for friends. There is a vast field in which we can labor, a field which is our own, but in which we may have for fellow-laborers many who, in the immediate province of religion, would be against us. Not that we are to make any concession to them, or to go out of our way to please them, — far from it ; but it is lawful and profitable to bring out the truth which they and we hold or may hold in common. We must follow out our own principles, and should never court or seek to gain them ; but if, in following out our own principles on literary, moral, historical, or political subjects, we gain them thus far, it is an advantage for us, if not for them, that we are under no obligation to forego. Thus Lingard, in writing the History of England, did well to keep to his character as an historian, and to waive in that work his character as a Catholic doctor. His business in his work was to write true history, not theology. If the truth of history redounded to the credit of his Church, all well and good ; so far the defence of his Church was legitimate ; but beyond that he had nothing to say on the subject. We wish he had been always mindful of this, and had suffered the theologian to appear less often ; for then he would have avoided certain judgments not called for by the purposes of his history, not essential to the full and impartial statement of historic truth, and which, however pleasant they may be to Protestants, are not a little painful to Catholics.

As to the form Catholic literature among us should assume,

there need be no controversy. We make no objection to the novel as a literary form, and it has much to recommend it. The strong man, of good taste, always avoids whatever is singular or eccentric, and conforms to the fashion and tastes of his age and country as far as he can do so without sacrificing truth and simplicity. The novel is a popular form, and may be adopted by those who have received the proper culture, and entertain just views, with advantage. Perhaps there is, just at the moment, no literary form which promises more advantage to the Catholic secular writer than the historical novel. What might not a Catholic of genius, talent, and learning have made of such a subject as Rienzi, Harold, Warwick "the king-maker," the destruction of Pompeii, Attila, Wat Tyler, Van Artevelde, Darnley, or many others seized upon by English novelists? He would have had open to him all the sources of interest which were open to Protestant authors, besides others peculiar to himself. He could have been at once true to nature, to history, and to religion and morals, and even without trenching upon the province of theological controversy. In Rienzi he could have shown us the impotence of genius, learning, and zeal to restore an order of things which have passed away, or to establish a political and social order incompatible with the ideas, manners, and customs of the age or country. In Harold he could have traced the effects on civilization in England, on the one hand, of the barbaric and heathen invasion by the Danes, and, on the other, of the partially civilized and Christianized Normans. In "The Last Days of Pompeii," he could have introduced real Christians in the place of the wild and uncouth fanatics imagined by Bulwer, delineated the corrupting effects of paganism, and sketched the amelioration of morals and manners which everywhere followed the introduction of Christianity. In Wat Tyler, or in Jack Cade, he might have portrayed the barbarous state of society which resulted from the establishment of the Northern barbarians on the ruins of Græco-Roman civilization, the sufferings of the enslaved masses, the arrogance and cruelty of the feudal nobility, and at the same time given by way of example solemn admonitions against the folly of attempting to reform society on pantheistic, Socialistic, and agrarian principles,—the madness of an insurrection of the poor against the rich, of subjects against legitimate sovereigns. History, indeed, is full of passages which are replete with instruction for the present, and which the enemies of truth and morals and social order have seized

upon and perverted to their base and destructive purposes. Why cannot Catholics seize upon them, and, without perverting them, use them in the cause of truth, justice, wisdom, and social order? Are we less learned, less active, less energetic than our enemies? Can we not do as much in the cause of truth as they do in the cause of error? In fact, we sometimes half doubt it, when we see large Catholic populations controlled, enslaved, by a handful of radicals, as we have seen in France and Italy.

Indeed, we feel a little indignant when we see, as we did in the old French Revolution, more than twenty millions of nominal Catholics subjected to the Reign of Terror, instituted and upheld by a small and contemptible faction, not numbering a twentieth of the whole population; or as we do two millions and a half in the Papal States without sufficient energy or force of character to free themselves from the despotism of a contemptible radical mob, numbering at best only a few thousands; or even in Catholic states, Jews, heretics, and infidels at the head of affairs; and we confess we cannot but think that the storm that is sweeping over them is but a just judgment of Almighty God upon them for their imbecility and sluggishness. It is time that the friends of truth try to prove themselves men, and to take the lead in affairs; and we are sure that Catholic secular writers in our day can render no better service even to religion than to possess themselves of the secular literature of the age, and to make it speak the language of truth, of wisdom, of moral majesty, — not in faint, timid tones, or feeble, apologetic whispers, that will be lost in the infidel, Socialistic, and revolutionary din of the times, but in free, bold, manly tones, that will ring through all men's hearts, and recall them to their senses, to think and to act. Resist the Devil and he will flee from you; show yourself afraid of him, cower and crouch before him, and you are gone. Pray, trust in God, by all means; but be also active, strong, energetic men, quick to perceive and fearless to perform what duty commands.

Of the little work, the title of which we have quoted at the head of this article, we have not much to say. It is a quiet, domestic tale, intended for children preparing for the sacrament of Confirmation. It shows fine taste, very considerable powers, and much facility on the part of the author, and gives us promise of far greater and better things from the same source hereafter. We like its design, its sweet spirit, and its healthy tone. The author has a ready eye for the beautiful, a keen

perception of character, and, with a little more maturity and practice, will be able to give us specimens of the domestic novel that will rank favorably by the side of Lady Fullerton's *Grantley Manor*, which, but for the mistake of mixing up Protestants and Catholics together, would have been a model of its class. We should have been better pleased with Miss Duval's book, if she had left out the excellent Protestant lady she has introduced, and also if she had been less theological. In her own proper department, that of the domestic novel, she writes admirably, with great truth and beauty ; but her theological attainments are not precisely those we look for in a theological professor. We do not mean this as a censure, for she everywhere maintains the modesty which becomes her sex, and professedly uses, in explaining Catholic doctrine, works which she could have no reason to distrust ; and the errors into which she is betrayed are the errors of those she has innocently followed. Yet, with the exception of three pages (152 - 154), which contain what we believe all theologians on a critical examination will agree with us is unsound doctrine, we like *Spirit Sculpture* very much, and cordially commend it to the Catholic public. We assure the excellent author that we shall be happy to meet her again in a larger and more elaborate work, and risk nothing in promising her beforehand the most gratifying success.

ART. V. — *House Document, No. 130. Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Education, to whom was recommitteed the Report on the Petition of John B. Fitzpatrick and others. House of Representatives, April 13, 1849.*

THE petition reported on was the petition of the Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Boston, and others, to the General Court, for an act incorporating the College of the Holy Cross in the city of Worcester. The petition was presented to the House by a distinguished member from this city, and referred to the Joint Standing Committee on Education. This committee consisted of seven members, and were divided on the subject of the petition four to three, the majority being against, and the minority in favor of, granting the act prayed for. The ma-

jority, without assigning any reason, reported that "the petitioners have leave to withdraw." This report was at first silently accepted, but was subsequently reconsidered in the House, and recommitted, with instructions to the committee to report their reasons. This the committee did in the document before us, which consists, first, of the report of the majority, assigning their reasons for refusing, and, second, of the report of the minority, accompanied by a bill granting the prayer of the petitioners. The reports came up in order, and, after an animated debate of two days, the bill was lost by a vote of 84 to 114, and the report of the majority was accepted.

This result was hardly in accordance with the real sense of the House, and we are sure could not have been obtained, had it not been for the false view of the prayer of the petitioners presented by the report of the majority. If the majority had represented the question in its true light and real bearings, free from foreign or irrelevant matters, there can be no doubt that a large majority of the House would have voted for the bill reported by the minority of the committee. Nevertheless, the petitioners make no complaint. The debate, which, with one exception, was characterized by more than ordinary courtesy on both sides, and by rare ability, good sense, manly feeling, statesmanlike views, legal learning, and logical acuteness and force on the side of the minority, will do good, and we entertain no apprehensions that the next legislature will not correct the mistake into which the present has been betrayed, and cheerfully grant the act of incorporation prayed for. We have full confidence in the wisdom, intelligence, and high sense of honor of this ancient Commonwealth, and it will take much to persuade us that she will for a moment hesitate to retrace a false step, which through misapprehension she may have taken, when once she perceives that it is demanded by her own honor or justice to any class of her citizens.

The report of the minority, though we differ from it on one or two points, is able, and highly creditable to Messrs. Upham, Motley, and Williams, whose names are appended to it; and Mr. Upham, especially, deserves the thanks of the friends of the college for his generous and stanch support of the bill he reported. But the report of the majority of the committee is a document of which we cannot speak in the terms which seem to us the most appropriate, without appearing to want that deference which should always be shown to the high official source from which it emanated. Yet we must be permitted to say,

that it appears to have been drawn up with a total disregard or misapprehension of the real nature of the prayer of the petitioners, and with an imperfect knowledge and understanding of the laws and policy of the Commonwealth, which, though natural enough in a fanatical country minister of one of the minor sects, we are surprised to meet in the report of a grave legislative committee. The best thing we are able to say of it is, that, when sound in its principles, it is inapplicable to the question before the committee, and when applicable, its principles are unsound and its statements unwarranted. Far be it from us to deny the ability or to question the motives of the learned gentleman who is understood to have penned it, and who so distinguished himself in the debate in the House ; but he seems to us to possess a very peculiar psychological conformation, and we are utterly at a loss to conceive the mental process by which he convinces himself that he arrives legitimately at his conclusions, or persuades himself that anything can justify his extraordinary statements. Instead of presenting the prayer of the petitioners for the action of the House in its true light and real bearings, his report seems to have been expressly designed to misrepresent it, to envelop it in a dense fog, to render it obscure and confused by mixing up with it foreign or irrelevant matters, and to prevent ordinary minds, without long and patient investigation, from being able to form any tolerable notion of its actual character, or to judge it on its own merits. That it had this effect on many minds in the House cannot be doubted ; and hence there is a propriety in our taking it up, and endeavouring to unravel its sophistries, to correct its mistakes and misstatements, and to present the prayer of the petitioners to the public in what we conceive to be its true light, and leave it to be accepted or rejected for what it really is, and not for something else.

It is true, this was done for the House, as far as it could be in the excitement of debate, by the very able and statesmanlike speeches of the supporters of the petition ; and if those speeches had been correctly or adequately reported and published, nothing more would need be said. But they were not correctly reported, and the ablest and most conclusive of them were mangled, mutilated, misrepresented, to a degree almost incredible. This was peculiarly the case with the masterly argument for the bill by Mr. Healy of Boston, who presented the petition to the House. Mr. Healy's speech, we may say, without the least disparagement to the speeches of the other gen-

tllemen who preceded or followed him on the same side, covered the whole field of discussion, dissipated, to all who understood him, the fog which had been collected around the question, disentangled it from all irrelevant matters which had been adroitly mixed up with it, placed it in its true light and real bearings, on its legitimate grounds, answered all the objections which had been or could be brought against it, showed its perfect accordance with the uniform policy of the laws of the Commonwealth, and proved conclusively, that, according to that policy, the petitioners made out a clear case, and were honestly entitled to a charter for their college ; and it did this with the calm earnestness and courtesy of manner, the clearness and distinctness of expression, the enlarged and liberal views, the depth and accuracy of legal knowledge, and the aptness and force of argument, for which that gentleman is so eminently distinguished. If we had that speech as it was delivered, we would not attempt to add a word of our own ; we would simply insert it in our pages, sure that it would carry conviction to every calm and deliberate reader. But we have it not, and cannot procure it. The report of it in the newspapers was meagre and false, in scarcely an instance giving what was actually said, and in some giving precisely the reverse. Under these circumstances, we trust we shall show no want of respect to the gentlemen who supported the prayer of the petitioners, if we renew the discussion of the question in our own feeble way, and reproduce as well as we can some few of the many arguments they used.

The petitioners — and of their petition we can speak with some knowledge, for we drew it, and were present at their first hearing before the committee — state that “ the College of the Holy Cross, a literary institution, in the city of Worcester, designed to teach a course of classical and scientific studies, equal to the course usually taught in the higher class of colleges in the United States, has now been in operation five years ; and it being proposed to enlarge the sphere of its operations,” they ask that certain individuals named, “ and their successors, be incorporated under the name of The College of the Holy Cross,” with the “ powers usually conferred on such institutions.” Here is the prayer of the petitioners ; it is simply for an act of incorporation as a college, with such powers as are usually conferred on colleges. To this prayer it was objected that the petitioners ask for a grant of unusual powers, special or exclusive privileges, or the patronage of the Commonwealth

for their religious denomination ; that their prayer cannot be granted without contradicting the uniform policy of our legislation, and revolutionizing, in principle, our whole system of public education ; and, in fine, that the petitioners do not make out a case which entitles them to an act of incorporation.

We here fairly state the sum of all that was objected, and we say very frankly in the outset, that, if these objections are pertinent or well founded, they are conclusive. All professedly Christian denominations stand, under our constitution and laws, on the same footing, and the legislature has no power to discriminate between them, in favor or in disfavor of one or another of them. If any one of them, forgetful of this, — or, indeed, as to that matter, if any particular class of our citizens, forgetful of the equality before the law of all classes, — comes before the legislature with a petition for exclusive favors, for special patronage, it should uniformly meet a stern and indignant refusal. On this point we, at least, shall join no issue with the report of the majority of the committee. But we venture to affirm, that the objections urged are without foundation, for the petitioners asked for no exclusive favors, for no patronage, for no unusual powers ; that they asked for nothing incompatible with the policy of our legislation, for nothing more than the legislature is every day in the habit of granting ; and that they did, as we shall see, make out as clear a case as the legislature usually requires.

The whole substance of the prayer of the petitioners, simply stated, is to be permitted to use a corporate seal, to be empowered to do as a corporation what they are now doing, have been doing for the last five years, will continue to do, and have a perfect right to do, under our constitution and laws, as individuals, and which the Commonwealth, if they are molested, is now bound to protect them in doing. This, which is an undeniable fact, is of itself a sufficient answer to all the objections urged, except the last. The petitioners ask for no grant from the public treasury, they ask for no rights or powers in regard to their religion not now secured to them by the constitution and laws ; and they ask only for certain facilities in transacting a perfectly lawful business, and even these facilities they ask for the convenience of those with whom the college must transact business full as much as for the convenience of the college itself. How, then, can it be said to ask for patronage, for exclusive privileges, for unusual powers, or the introduction of a new principle into our legislation ?

As far as we can understand the report of the committee, which unhappily is rarely very definite in its statements, its charge is grounded on the fact that the college belongs to a particular denomination of Christians, and is to be open only to such as conform to the faith, discipline, and worship of that denomination. This, the report says, "appears to constitute the distinctive feature and turning-point of the case." "The petitioners ask for a college strictly and exclusively sectarian in its type and character, under influences and rules which practically exclude the great majority of our youth, and which, being vital, cannot be altered." (p. 4.) This is hardly correct, but let it pass. Whence, we ask, does it follow that the petitioners ask for anything exclusive, any unusual power, or anything contrary to the policy of our laws, even if this be so? Does the report mean to insinuate that the petitioners ask, or need, an act of incorporation to authorize them to teach their religion in their college, and to receive into it only those who conform to it? If so, it is a mistake. The petitioners have asked, and need to ask, for nothing of the sort; for the right to do all this they already possess, and they are exercising it now with the recognition and under the protection of the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth, which guaranty to all the freedom of faith and worship. The Congregationalists have a perfect legal right to establish a college in which none but Congregationalists shall be professors, and none but Congregational youth shall be admitted as pupils or students. As much must be said, too, of Protestant Episcopalians, Baptists, Methodists, Unitarians, Universalists, and Quakers. Less than this, then, cannot be said of Catholics; for they, in the eye of the law, stand on the same footing with Congregationalists, and have equal rights with them. If, then, Catholics choose at their own expense to found a Catholic college exclusively for Catholics, into which none but Catholics are admissible as pupils or students, they have a legal right, and do not need a legislative grant to enable them, to do so, as the report itself, with an inconsistency remarkable enough, fully concedes. "Our principles and policy forbid," it says, "our giving special privileges for sectarian education, *while we cheerfully tolerate and protect all the institutions sectarian influence may establish.*"—p. 7.

The incorporation of a college founded by, and exclusively for, Catholics does not give to the college the right to be exclusively Catholic; for the right to be so it possesses prior to

the act of incorporation, and independently of it. That right, which is not conferred by the charter, must survive the incorporation unless the charter itself positively annuls it. Here is what the report has the air of overlooking. The report confounds not taking away a right with conferring a right ; and because the petitioners refused to accept a charter that would take away a right which they now have, it represents them as asking a charter that confers upon them that right, and therefore as asking for a special favor, and the grant of unusual powers, — a misapprehension, or an instance of fallacious reasoning, not usual, we apprehend, in grave legislative documents.

The report says the committee offered the petitioners the charter of Amherst College, in which is a clause prohibiting the religious freedom which the petitioners refused to surrender, and concludes, from the fact that they would not accept it, that they asked for unusual powers. This conclusion is not warranted. The petitioners did not refuse that charter because it did not confer on them an unusual power, but because it required them to make an unusual surrender of private rights. They did not ask a charter which should confer the right of making their college a Catholic college, exclusively for youth of their own religion, but they did not choose to accept one which deprived them of the right to make it so. The charter of Amherst College would deprive them of their religious freedom, and they did not choose to be deprived of it. Nor did they think the legislature had any right to insist on their giving it up as the consideration of receiving an act of incorporation. If they had come before the legislature with a request to be incorporated as a public institution, to be supported in whole or in part at the public expense, they would cheerfully have conceded the right of the legislature to exact the conditions proposed as those on which it would bestow its bounty ; for the State has no right, placing as it does all religious denominations on the same footing, to endow any literary institution which is for the exclusive benefit of any particular religious denomination. Public institutions, supported at the public expense, must be open to the public, open to all classes of citizens who choose to avail themselves of them. The State has no right to endow a college under the control of Catholics, which Protestants cannot enter without violence to their Protestant conscience ; and, for the same reason, it has no right to found a college under the control of any one

of the Protestant sects, which Catholics cannot enter without violence to their Catholic conscience. But this has nothing to do with the case before us, because the petitioners did not ask for State patronage, for a public endowment. They had erected, sustained thus far, and proposed for the future to sustain, their college with their own private funds, without receiving or wishing to receive any bounty from the public treasury. This makes all the difference in the world. The reasons which justify, nay, demand, the restrictive clause of the charter of Amherst College in the charter of a public college, designed to be a public college, and to be supported as such from the public treasury, could not, therefore, apply in their case, and we do not understand what right the committee had to propose such a restrictive clause. To propose it was to demand the surrender of a right without offering any compensation in return.

The original policy it adopted in regard to Amherst College, and which it adopted under the influence of feelings hostile to the denomination that founded it and prayed for its incorporation, the legislature itself has since abandoned. That policy was to subject the college to all the restrictions, and yet to grant it none of the advantages, of a public institution, — to take away the denominational rights of its founders and supporters, and yet to give it no claims upon the public in return. A more unjust policy it is difficult to conceive, and it was felt to be extremely unjust at the time, by the friends of the college. But they submitted, probably because they saw that by submitting they could, in practice, keep the college under their control, make it in fact as denominational as they wished, and yet one day get it supported as a public college; for by submitting they obtained the right to come into the legislature, and tell it, that, having made the college a public institution, it is now bound to support it. They have availed themselves of this right, and Amherst College is now supported in part from the public treasury. The legislature saw that it could not maintain its original policy, that it must, in common justice, either give back to the college its religious freedom, or else give it public support. It chose the latter; but this was as much an abandonment of its original policy, as if it had struck out the clause restricting the religious freedom of the college. It was hardly fair in the committee, with this fact before their eyes, to offer the petitioners, who had no wish to make their college a public institution, or to receive State patronage, the charter of Amherst College.

Nor was this all. The petitioners asked for an act conferring the powers *usually* conferred, and the committee offered them a charter which demands an unusual surrender of rights ; and, because the petitioners refused it, the committee gravely report that they asked for *unusual* powers, and would not be content with a charter conferring those which are usual. Hence the majority and the advocates of their report in the House take occasion to rebuke, in their smooth way, the petitioners for their impudence in asking more than equal rights ; and this with such blandness of manner, and such an air of good faith, that some did not for the moment see through it, and verily supposed that the committee were really willing to grant a reasonable charter, but that the petitioners were so exorbitant in their demands that it was the painful duty of every honest legislature to refuse them. Now the committee knew perfectly well, before they offered the charter of Amherst College, that it would not be accepted. Why, then, did they offer it ? Was it because they dared not assume the responsibility of directly refusing the act of incorporation prayed for, and because they wished the public to get the impression that the refusal was due to the fact that the petitioners themselves would not accept a charter in the usual form ? Are we wanting in respect to the committee, if we suggest that in this they gave a better exemplification of what is popularly understood by the word *Jesuitical* than of that open and manly proceeding which we always look for in grave and dignified legislators ?

But how could the refusal on the part of the petitioners to accept the charter of Amherst College be construed into a proof that they would not be contented with a charter in the usual form ? At the close of their first hearing, the committee asked the petitioners if they wished anything peculiar in their charter ; and were answered, by ourselves, " No ; nothing peculiar ; all we want is a charter in the usual form." But the charter of Amherst College is not in the usual form ; it is peculiar ; it stands " solitary and alone," and the restrictive clause to which the petitioners objected is found in the charter of no other incorporated literary institution in the State. This fact the committee knew, or should have known. Surely, to offer an unusual form was not to offer the usual, and to refuse an unusual form was not proof that the usual form would not have been accepted. The committee say the petitioners would not accept a charter in the *usual* form, and adduce as

proof the fact that they refused to accept an *unusual* form ! The fact is, the committee did not offer the petitioners a charter in the usual form, and they had the full assurance, that, if they would, it would not be refused. If the committee were willing to give a charter in the usual form, why did they not offer it ? Did they offer the charter of Williams College ? Not they. If they had, it would have been willingly accepted ; and that is a far more usual form than that which was offered. Yet the majority place their refusal to grant the prayer of the petitioners solely on the ground that they asked for unusual powers, exclusive privileges, and were not willing to be placed on the same footing, before the State, with other religious denominations ! Is the logic of the majority of the committee as peculiar as their ingenuousness ?

The report has much to say of the exclusiveness avowed and insisted on by the petitioners. Its author would fain persuade us that this exclusiveness was the sole objection to granting their prayer. He alleges that the petitioners "stated that they were exclusive and must be so, and were frank enough further to admit, that, had they the civil power, they *could not* exercise it otherwise than exclusively as to religious rights." That the petitioners made any such admission, in the sense here implied, as to what they should be obliged to do if they had the civil power, is not a fact, and such admission would have been false if it had been made, as every man knows who knows anything of the religion professed by the petitioners. The author of the report must have misapprehended the answer of the petitioners to a question which exceeded the competency of a legislative committee to ask. Whether the petitioners are or are not exclusive in their religious views, what are or are not their religious tenets, the principles of their discipline, or the forms of their worship, their merits or demerits as a religious denomination, are matters, as the report itself, with admirable inconsistency, frankly acknowledges, "with which the legislature has nothing to do," (p. 7,) and therefore no proper subjects of legislative investigation or of legislative report. The petitioners, doubtless, have their religion ; but whether true or false, good or bad, is, so far as the government is concerned, their own private affair. They are free to profess it, and they have the right to call in the Commonwealth, if necessary, to protect them in its free, full, and peaceable profession and enjoyment ; for need we at every turn repeat, that all professedly Christian denomina-

tions, under our constitution and laws, stand on the same footing, and have legally, not, as some say, equal *toleration*, but equal *rights*?

That the College of the Holy Cross is designed for Catholic youth, and refuses to receive non-Catholic youth, nobody denies; but it is not true, as the report appears to maintain, that this exclusiveness is vital, is a rule of the Catholic religion, and cannot be altered. The petitioners did not say, that, in this respect, they are and *must be* exclusive. They informed the committee in our hearing expressly to the contrary, that the rule obtained in no other Catholic college in the United States. There is no principle in the Catholic religion which requires Catholic colleges to refuse to admit to their course of studies non-Catholic youth, and in all the Catholic colleges in the country, except the one in Worcester, they are received, and without being required to conform to the Catholic faith and discipline.

The college in Worcester is exclusive in this respect, because its founder deemed it prudent to make it so, and because its present managers have seen no good reason for making it otherwise. The great complaint against Catholic colleges, particularly in the West, is that they are proselyting institutions, intended, under pretence of giving a classical education, to steal away the youth of non-Catholics, and convert them to the Catholic religion. This complaint, we all know, was brought against the Female Academy of the Ursuline Convent in Charlestown, and nobody doubts that one of the principal causes which excited a mob to lay it in ashes was the fact that many of its pupils were from our respectable Protestant families. It was to obviate a like catastrophe for his college, to escape the loud complaints made by non-Catholics against the Catholic literary institutions of the country, that its munificent founder, the late learned and eminent Bishop Fenwick, who wished as far as possible to live in peace with all men, and to give occasion of wrath to none, adopted the exclusive rule, and refused to receive into the College of the Holy Cross any but children of Catholic parents, or such as, with their own free will and the free and full consent of their parents or guardians, were preparing to become Catholics. He wished a college for the Catholic youth growing up in our midst, under his care, both for their sake and for the sake of the community, for he was a public-spirited citizen, a friend of the young and of education; and he sought to obtain such a

college, without giving umbrage to his Protestant neighbours and fellow-citizens, or doing anything to provoke their hostility or suspicions against his college, or the people of his charge. Here was the motive which led to the adoption of the rule, a motive wholly in the interests of the non-Catholic portion of the community; and the rule is unalterable only because the college does not choose to alter it. Being established and supported by Catholics with their own private funds, the college believes that it has the perfect right to confine its benefits to Catholic youth, and therefore does not choose to accept a charter which prohibits them from doing so, or which requires it with their private funds to educate youth out of their denomination. But if the legislature should attempt to make the rule obligatory, and forbid the reception of any but Catholic youth, it would perhaps find the college as little disposed to accept its action as when it proposes a charter which suppresses it. This, as the college is private property, and the petitioners do not wish to make it a public institution, they regard as a matter within their own competency, and they insist on retaining their freedom to receive or not to receive, as they judge proper.

Is it not, however, a little singular that gentlemen who evidently are no admirers of the religion of the petitioners should make it their only objection to incorporating the College of the Holy Cross, that it refuses to receive to its course of studies the children of non-Catholics? Do they thus object, because they have sons whom they wish to place in that college, — because they are desirous that the youth of the Commonwealth should be educated under Roman Catholic influences, in a Roman Catholic college, by Roman Catholic priests? or is it because they are unwilling that Catholics should have a college for their own youth, and seize upon this exclusiveness as a pretext for suppressing as far as in them lies the freedom of education? Shall we be unjust to those gentlemen if we suggest, that, in all probability, they would find the college still more objectionable to them if it were not exclusive? We can easily fancy, if the college had been open to all, that this same highly respectable committee would have rung the changes on the very opposite objection, and have gravely reported, Since the College of the Holy Cross is evidently intended to be a proselyting institution, and, under pretence of giving a classical education, to mould the young and ductile minds of our non-Catholic youth to its peculiar

religion, and since the legislature has no right to aid or countenance it in this its insidious design, therefore, the petitioners have leave to withdraw. They could have made this objection, under the supposition, with as much propriety as the one they now urge ; and we can hardly doubt that they would very readily and even eagerly have urged it.

What we have said sufficiently proves that the petitioners asked for nothing unusual, nothing exclusive, — for no State patronage ; we further add, that what they did ask for required the introduction of no new principle into our legislative policy. On this point we reluctantly differ from the excellent report of the minority, as well as from that of the majority. The report of the majority, as we have intimated, is never very explicit, and insinuates rather than distinctly states its meaning ; but if it is not mere verbiage or idle declamation, which we are not by any means to suppose of a grave legislative report, it means to assert that there is not a single literary institution, within the bounds of the State, incorporated on the principle contended for by the petitioners. The petitioners ask for an act of incorporation which leaves them their present right of not admitting into their college non-Catholic students, or of admitting only the youth of their own denomination. This the committee themselves tell us is “ the distinctive feature and turning-point in the case,” and the principle here involved is that, and that only, to which they profess to object. This principle, they imply, is a novelty in our legislation. “ Has Massachusetts,” they ask, “ ever recognized such a principle ? Is there an incorporated institution within her borders which *requires* such a religious conformity as to operate to the exclusion of a single individual ? Are our common schools or our normal schools on such a basis ? Are not one and all of the corporate literary institutions, from the professional schools of theology, law, and medicine, down to the smallest district school, open to all classes without distinction of sect, the privileges of which they may enjoy without any *annoying* religious conformity ? ” This, if it means anything to the purpose, means that there is not a single incorporated literary institution in the Commonwealth, which is not legally open to all classes of citizens, and therefore legally *forbidden* to exact any religious qualification as the condition of the free and full enjoyment of its benefits. Is this true ?

The committee raise here a question of fact, not of speculation, and, striking out of the account the common and normal

schools, which are State schools, and do not come into the category of incorporated institutions in the sense applicable to the case before us, the reverse of what they state, with the single exception of Amherst College, happens to be the fact. The right to be exclusive, in the sense in which the College of the Holy Cross is exclusive, is in this Commonwealth inherent in every religious denomination, because essential to the freedom of each to profess and teach its own religion. Its denial would be the total denial of the freedom of religion, which is guaranteed by the constitution and laws to every professedly Christian denomination. It therefore survives in every incorporated literary institution whose charter does not expressly prohibit it. No clause in the charter is required to confer it; it is legally possessed, if there is none that takes it away. This is undeniable. Hence the petitioners asked for no charter conferring that right; they only refused a charter which took it away, — that is, deprived them of their religious freedom.

Now the clause prohibiting this religious freedom is to be found in the charter of no incorporated literary institution in this Commonwealth, except that of Amherst College; and the only instances we are aware of, in the whole history of the legislation of this State, in which there has been an attempt by the legislature to suppress the religious liberty of literary institutions, are the one made under anti-Trinitarian and anti-Calvinistic influences in the case of Amherst College, and that made by the majority of the committee in the case before us. The principle which the committee say is not recognized by Massachusetts is recognized by her to the full extent that the petitioners demand in the charter of Williams College at Williamstown, the Baptist Theological Institute at Newton, the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, and the Congregational Theological Seminary at Andover. Here are four incorporated institutions, not one of which is subjected to the prohibitory clause of Amherst College. Is it not singular, that, in the face of this well-known and undeniable fact, the committee should make their extraordinary denial? Is it not singular that they should say that *none* of our incorporated literary institutions are on the basis they object to, when, in fact, all *but one* are on that basis and no other, and possess all the freedom for their religion demanded by the College of the Holy Cross?

The case of the Andover Theological Seminary is peculiarly apposite to our purpose. It was founded by private munificence for the Congregational denomination. It holds its funds on the

express condition of being exclusively Congregational. They are forfeited unless the professors subscribe a certain creed, and to prevent it from ever becoming other than exclusive, or departing from the faith to which it is pledged, the professors are required solemnly to renew their subscriptions to that creed once in every five years. Everybody who knows the history of the institution knows that it was intended to be strictly denominational, and that every legal device the astutest lawyers could devise was resorted to to prevent it from ever becoming otherwise. The motive of its founders was to guard against its following the example of Harvard College, which had become Unitarian ; and they secured for it, not only the legal right to be strictly and exclusively Congregational, but bound it by all the means in their power never to be anything else. And yet Andover Theological Seminary enjoys a charter from the legislature of this State. Here is a recognition of the principle objected to by the committee, of which they should not have been ignorant. It is true, that when Mr. Healy in the House asserted that Andover was in law and in fact exclusive, the gentleman who presented the report of the majority of the committee rose in his place and contradicted him. He said that he had himself been educated at Andover ; he knew the institution well, and asserted on his own knowledge that such was not the fact, either legally or practically. But Mr. Upham of Salem, who presented the report of the minority, produced, from the State library, the charter, and asked permission to read it, which was granted. When it was read, the respectable and learned gentleman who had so positively, on his own knowledge, contradicted Mr. Healy, rose and frankly acknowledged that he was wrong, and that what Mr. Healy had said was true. The acknowledgment was honorable, no doubt, to the gentleman who made it ; but, nevertheless, it left him in an attitude somewhat awkward, and proved that his statements, whether in his report or in his speeches, were not always to be taken as indisputable facts.

This incident settled the question as to exclusiveness of the Andover Seminary, which was well known before to everybody, except to the reverend gentleman who had received his education in it, and knew it well ; and settling that question negatived the assertion of the committee. The idea that theological institutions founded by a particular denomination, for the express purpose of teaching its peculiar theology, and training up candidates for its peculiar ministry, are not exclusive, and that their

benefits can be equally enjoyed by those who do and those who do not conform to the religion taught, seems to us original, and we doubt whether it ever entered into the head of anybody before it was conceived by the learned and ingenious author of the report of the majority of the committee. It perhaps ought to secure him great honor as an original inventor, but we fear that he will find most people disposed to regard his invention as nothing more than the product of a remarkable idiosyncrasy, or of a distempered fancy which sometimes sees things "not to be seen."

It is nothing to our purpose whether Williams College, the Wesleyan Seminary, the Baptist Theological Institute, and the Andover Theological Seminary, are or are not in practice exclusive; it is enough for our purpose that they have the legal right to be as exclusive as they please. There is nothing in their charters, or in the legislation connected with them, that prohibits them from being as strictly denominational as the College of the Holy Cross. Yet it is said that even in practice they are not quite so unexclusive as they profess, and we much doubt if there is one of them that does not exert such influence as it has to secure conformity to its own peculiar religious views and tendencies. But whether so or not, we do not complain. We say they have the legal right to be exclusive, because there is nothing in their charter restricting them; and having this legal right, we say it is a mistake to assert that the petitioners ask for the introduction of a new principle into our legislation. The truth is the reverse of what the committee assert. What the petitioners ask for is in perfect accordance with the principles, with one exception, sanctioned by the uniform practice of the legislature, and that exception, as we have seen, is not to be taken into the account.

The principle which the committee assert, simply stated, is, that no charter of incorporation should be granted to an institution which is under the control and for the exclusive benefit of a particular religious denomination. But this principle is unknown to our legislation, and the legislature never refuses to incorporate a religious congregation or parish on the ground of its exclusive denominational character. We have not heard that any objection of this sort is ever raised. Congregationalists, Baptists, Unitarians, Universalists, and others, obtain acts of incorporation for their congregations and parishes, which are for purely denominational purposes and no others. What is the difference between incorporating a denominational parish,

and incorporating a denominational college? In either case the legislature gives no sanction to the religion of the corporation; it merely grants to a class of citizens facilities of using a corporate seal in the transacting of business which is perfectly lawful to them as individuals. The principle is the same, whether the corporation be a college or a parish; and there is nothing to be objected in the one case that may not be in the other.

The committee seems all the time to labor under the hallucination, that the petitioners ask the legislature to grant them the right to teach their religion, and to authorize them to require the youth admitted into their college to conform to it. This, we grant, would be the introduction of a new principle into our legislation. But how often must we repeat that they ask no such thing? They recognize in the legislature no authority to give or to take away this right. This is a matter on which they only ask the legislature to leave them where they are. They say that they have a right to teach their religion, that they have a right with their own funds to erect a college and to say who may enjoy its advantages and who may not, and that to refuse them an act of incorporation because they will not consent to be deprived of that right is as unreasonable and as unjust as it would be to refuse to incorporate a manufacturing company on the ground that it claimed the right of exercising its own discretion as to the persons with whom it should deal or whom it should employ. Suppose such company claims the right, and should very frankly tell the legislature, beforehand, that it intends, to trade with and employ only members of the Congregational denomination: would that be a valid reason for refusing to charter it? or would a charter not denying them that right require the introduction of a new principle into our legislation? If so, on what principle does the legislature charter a company to erect and keep a temperance hotel? The legislature has nothing to do with those private transactions of a private corporation, for the doing of which corporate powers are neither needed nor asked, any more than it has with the transactions of a private individual; and therefore they can be no reason for granting or for withholding a charter. The things which the College of the Holy Cross claims the right to do, and to which the committee object, are not things to be done under cover of a charter of incorporation, — will not be, and are not wished to be, done by virtue of any corporate authority the legislature may confer; but will be done by the corporators in their unincorporate ca-

capacity, by virtue of rights possessed by them in common with all private or associated citizens of the Commonwealth. The corporation as such has no more to do with them than the manufacturing corporation has with the fact whether the individual corporators go to bed at nine o'clock or at twelve, eat white bread or brown, or pray standing or kneeling. The corporate seal merely covers the business transactions, and all else that is done is done by virtue, not of corporate, but of private powers. The charter of incorporation gives, then, no sanction, express or implied, to the religion, discipline, worship, internal arrangements, or management of the college, and the objection founded on the supposition that it would give a sanction to them falls to the ground.

The pretence set up, that the incorporation of the College of the Holy Cross would revolutionize our whole system of public education, cannot stand a moment, for the very good reason that the principle on which it asked to be incorporated is the principle common to all our colleges and incorporated literary institutions, with the single exception of Amherst College, and because its incorporation does not make it a part of our public system of education, but leaves it as it is now, a part of the private education of the Commonwealth. It has never been, and we trust it will never be, the policy of old Massachusetts to prohibit private education, and adopt a system of compulsory public education. She always has respected, and we trust always will respect, in matters of education, the rights of conscience, and also the rights of parents and guardians. She establishes a system of public schools, and a noble system it is too, and for this we honor her ; but she does not compel parents to send their children, or guardians their wards, to her public schools, or forbid them to open or patronize private schools, if such be their choice. Far distant, we trust, is the day when she will follow the example of European despots and deny to her citizens the liberty of education. There need, then, be nothing more said on this point. The incorporation of the College of the Holy Cross would not authorize it to perform a single act or do a single thing which it is not now doing, and which it may not continue to do with the full sanction of our laws as they are. This is an undeniable fact, which we beg the opponents of the college to bear in mind. If, then, the college does not now interfere with our system of public education, and everybody knows that it does not, it would not, and could not, if incorporated.

We ourselves should be sorry to see any measure adopted which would revolutionize or in any way interfere with our present system of public schools ; for we happen to be citizens, and not unproud citizens, of old Massachusetts, and we have as deep an interest in the preservation and successful working of that system as has any other citizen of the Commonwealth. That system is designed to be open to all the children of the Commonwealth, and to furnish them a good common education. Considering the variety of religious views in the State, and the fact that the State is bound to treat them all with equal respect, the relation of the public schools to religion must be negative, excluding what is peculiar to each denomination, and admitting only what is common to them all. There is no justice in the complaints which have been heard from several quarters, that our common schools are not as positively religious as they should be. We are in favor, and decidedly in favor, of a system of common school education for all the children of the Commonwealth, and we are not so unreasonable as to object to the only conditions on which such a system can be established and maintained. Our common schools cannot be more positively religious than they now are, unless they adopt the peculiar doctrines of some one of the several religious denominations which divide our citizens ; and if they were authorized or permitted to do this, the favored denomination would be virtually established by law, and its peculiar religion made the religion of the State, which would be to deny that freedom of its religion now secured to every denomination, and to render it henceforth untrue that all denominations stand on the same footing before the constitution and laws, having equal rights, and entitled to equal legal respect and protection.

But at the same time that our public schools must refrain from meddling with religion, except so far as all professedly Christian denominations are agreed, it will not do for the State to say that we shall have no schools which are more positively religious ; for that would be to deny to every denomination the freedom of its religion, — to prohibit, so far as education is concerned, all religion but a vague generality, which, if taken alone, is satisfactory to no class of believers, and in practice is tantamount to no religion at all. The deficiency of religious instruction in our common schools is now supplied by denominational schools, — by each denomination in its own way, according to its own views of truth, — and therefore is no evil, and no objection to the system of common school instruction. But

to deny to our citizens the right of establishing and supporting these denominational schools would be the denial to each denomination of its undoubted constitutional right to educate its children in its own peculiar religion. The State cannot do this ; for, if it cannot in its schools teach any particular form of Christianity, it cannot, on the other hand, authorize the teaching of infidelity. But when any denomination asks for more positive religious instruction than the State can give without discriminating between denominations, or when it asks for schools in which its children, while acquiring a literary and scientific education, shall be trained up in its peculiar religious faith, discipline, and worship, it must establish and support them at its own expense. It is only in this way that, in a community divided on the subject of religion into different denominations or sects, it is possible to establish a system of public instruction on the one hand, and of religious education on the other, with a due regard for the equal rights of all and the special religious views of each. The State provides a system of education for all in common, as far as all are willing to abide by what all have or can receive in common, and each denomination provides for what is not common to all, for what is peculiar to itself, by a system of private schools of its own, free, so long as they infringe the rights of no other denomination, from the control of the public. This is what our Commonwealth does, and with this no reasonable man can find any fault.

Catholics are as much attached to the existing system of common schools as Protestants are, as we may infer from the fact, that full one third of all the children in the public schools of this city are children of Catholic parents. They derive great advantage from these schools, — no class of our citizens greater advantages than they are now deriving, — and they must be strangely shortsighted to wish for the sanction of any measure by the legislature that shall tend to lessen their importance or their efficiency, — that may change the basis on which they are established, or endanger their existence. But these schools, though sufficient for the great mass of the children of the Commonwealth, are not sufficient for all. We are the friends of classical education, and ask for schools of a higher order, that can give it ; we wish also to be free to make our own selection of the schools to which we shall send our sons or our daughters to obtain it ; and we apprehend that, in saying this, we only express the common sentiment and the common right of all parents. We wish also to be able, when we send our children

away from the domestic circle to a school where we cannot ourselves watch over their religion and morals, to send them to a school in which we have full confidence, and where they will be under such religious influences as we approve, and trained up in the religion and morality we hold to be true and acceptable to their Heavenly Father. This cannot be, unless the school is under the control of the denomination to which we ourselves happen to belong. We are, therefore, in favor of every denomination having its own denominational college, supported, indeed, not from the public treasury, but from its own private funds. No harm would result, for a sound and thorough education is not likely to become too common or to be too widely diffused through the community. We must deal with the world as we find it. Various denominations with peculiar views exist, and are "fixed facts" in our community, and the State cannot overlook them, and deal with her citizens as if they were all of the same religion, or as if she had a right to discriminate between one form of Christianity and another. Up to a certain point, all can go together; up to that point let the State provide, as in our common schools, for all in common; beyond that point, let her simply furnish the necessary facilities and protection for each denomination to provide for itself in its own way, — only exacting that each shall respect in the other the right it demands for itself.

But the report furthermore asserts, that, passing over the other objections, the petitioners do not make out a case; that is, do not show a public reason why they should receive a charter. "It seems to your committee," says the report (p. 6), "that there is a fair and sufficient objection to the charter prayed for, that the institution under it will still remain a private and not a public institution. A public institution is one open to the whole community, and which is supposed to confer its benefits as widely as possible. The legislature have no right to grant any charter without the prospect of a public benefit to result plainly and promptly therefrom. The general ground of objection to acts of incorporation is, that they confer no benefits on the public, but are special and exclusive in the interests they protect. This objection, wherever it lies, is conclusive." It does lie against the charter prayed for; therefore the legislature has no right to grant it.

But this objection, if valid against the prayer of the petitioners, is valid against all corporations not public in their character, and proves that the legislature has no right to charter a pri-

vate corporation, — which is the extreme radical doctrine on the subject. Do the committee mean to maintain that all private corporations are unconstitutional? This is a bold doctrine to be put forth in a State all covered over with private corporations, by the committee of a legislature in the daily habit of granting them. If this doctrine is to prevail, it will stand our numerous literary, religious, and manufacturing and other business corporations in hand to look well to their position, and close up their concerns as soon as possible, for their charters are no better than so much waste-paper. No manufacturing or simple business corporation is a public corporation; no particular incorporated religious or denominational society or parish is a public corporation; and Andover Theological Seminary is nothing in the world but a private corporation. The legislature, if the committee are right, has for a long time been singularly deficient in regard for the constitution, and our wisest statesmen and legislators have been mere ninnies. What a pity that the learned author of the report had not been born some fifty years sooner, so as to have saved our legislators from committing their numerous blunders!

But we deny the doctrine of the report on corporations. The principle which it asserts may be true, when applied to the granting of powers to corporations, which interfere with the property, rights, or privileges of others; but powers of this sort do not inhere in the corporation as such, and cannot be exercised by it, unless specially granted. Mr. Healy stated the true doctrine on corporations, and showed conclusively, in his speech in the House, that the established policy of the Commonwealth is to grant charters of corporations where there is a reasonable prospect of benefit to the corporators, and no danger of injury to the public, or infringement of the rights of any other party. Such corporations are for the public benefit, because the public benefit is in the benefit of the parts, and is augmented whenever the benefit of any one of the parts is augmented without subtracting from the rights of any other part. This is the principle of Massachusetts legislation in regard to corporations, as is obvious to any one who chooses to look into the history of her legislation on the subject. The applicants for a corporation must undoubtedly satisfy the legislature that there is a reasonable prospect of a benefit to be derived to them from the act of incorporation, and that what they ask does not interfere with the rights or legitimate interests of any other party. When they have satisfied the legislature on

these two points, they have made out their case, and are entitled to a charter, and the legislature is bound by the uniform policy of the Commonwealth to grant it.

Nobody pretends, that, in the case of the petitioners, the first of these two points was not sufficiently made out; the second was evident of itself, because all they proposed to do as a corporation, the use of the corporate seal excepted, they are already doing with the sanction and under the protection of the laws. Their case was then made out in both its parts, and the legislature was bound by its uniform policy to grant their prayer. The corporation being for their benefit, and injurious to no one, is for the public benefit, and they had therefore the right to ask it, not as a boon, not as a special favor, which the petitioners had too much self-respect as well as too much public spirit to ask, but as a facility for the transacting of a perfectly lawful business, due from the legislature, under like circumstances, to any class of citizens who may ask for it; for it is bound to consult the public good, — to promote the public benefit.

But the petitioners made out, in fact, a stronger case than is here supposed. They petitioned, not for a college, — for that they had, and had founded and intended to support with their own private funds, — but for an act of incorporation. Their college is designed to impart a literary and scientific education to a very considerable number of the youth of this Commonwealth, who would not receive that education elsewhere, and we need not say, here in Massachusetts, that the education of any portion of our youth is a public benefit. That matter is not here a mooted question. Education is regarded as of so high public utility that even private individuals who have no children to educate are publicly taxed to pay for it, and the public at large are compelled to contribute, not only to the support of common schools, but of academies and colleges, whose direct benefit, in the nature of the case, can be enjoyed only by a very small portion of the community. We need but refer to the public grants, to Cambridge University, to Williams and Amherst Colleges, to prove that the Commonwealth holds the literary and scientific education of the few to be for the benefit of the many, — for the benefit, in fact, of the public. Nay, the committee themselves concede this, and thus answer their own objection. "True," say they, "*the education of their children in learning and knowledge WILL BE A PUBLIC BENEFIT.*" (p. 7.) This is enough, and, even conceding the untenable doctrine of

the committee on corporations, would entitle the petitioners to the grant of the charter prayed for. The committee add, indeed, that the petitioners "have the means of all this through the public schools and institutions, which are truly open to them as to all"; but this, though it might be a good reason against incorporating an additional college to be supported in whole or in part from the public treasury, is no objection to the incorporation of a college to be supported by private funds, without any charge on the public. Indeed, the petitioners made out an unusually strong case, if the committee are to be believed, why they should have had the act prayed for. They proposed to support their college themselves, and, in doing so, proposed to confer from their private resources a public benefit; for the committee acknowledge that "the education of their children in learning and knowledge would be a public benefit." It is not every day that citizens come before the legislature, and petition to be authorized to use a corporate seal in conferring a public benefit at their own expense. Yet this is what the petitioners actually did, according to the committee themselves. Nevertheless, the committee regarded it as a fair and sufficient reason to refuse them a charter, because no public benefit was to result therefrom!

The committee appear to treat the prayer of the petitioners as if their college was designed primarily for teaching the Roman Catholic religion. If such had been the fact, it would have been no valid reason against incorporating it, since our constitution and laws place Roman Catholics and the several Protestant sects on the same footing, and guaranty to them all equal rights. But such was not the fact. The College of the Holy Cross is a literary and scientific institution, and its primary design is to impart a literary and scientific education. The religion is incidental to the main design. It can hardly be proposed, in a Christian commonwealth, that youth shall be sent from home, and educated in colleges which have no religion, no faith, no worship, — especially at that critical period when the passions begin to unfold, and the character is forming. We profess to be a Christian people, and are by no means prepared for a system of infidel or atheistic education, like that which Frances Wright and Abner Kneeland proposed and labored to introduce into our country. But if religion at all is to enter into our colleges, it must enter in some form, and then in the form of some particular denomination. It is impossible that it should be otherwise, for religion in a vague generality ab-

stracted from all forms is practically no religion at all. It must be Catholic, Episcopalian, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, Unitarian, &c. Hence the religion of Cambridge University is Unitarian, of Williams and Amherst Colleges, Congregational. In the same sense the religion of the College of the Holy Cross is Catholic. It is inevitable that the college have the religion of some one denomination, or that it have no religion at all. The thing is so, and cannot be helped. Experience proves, that, let the law and let profession say what they may, the religion of some one denomination is the religion of the college, if not a godless college. Between the religion of different denominations the legislature has no authority to discriminate, and to say what religion may and what may not be the religion of this or that college. Consequently, whatever be the particular religion of the college, it can be no valid reason for granting or refusing to grant it a charter. If the college claims, not only its religion, but the right to admit only such as will conform to it, that may be a good reason for not chartering it as a college to be supported at the public charge, but it is no reason at all for refusing to charter it as a college to be supported by the private funds of the denomination under whose influence it is established.

We have here answered all the objections which were urged against granting the prayer of the petitioners, and have shown, that, according to the uniform policy of the Commonwealth, it should have been granted. We have no doubt that the reason why it was not granted was simply because, the case having been misrepresented to the House in the first instance, many members were unable to seize its real character and actual bearings. The bill, however, received a generous support, and, although it failed to secure the vote of the majority, it secured the weight of the talent and respectability of the House, whether of one political party or another. The vote itself we regard as amply sufficient to refute the charge of bigotry so often brought against this Commonwealth by those who are ignorant of her character, as well as the charge set up abroad that the bill was lost in consequence of hostility to Catholics. For ourselves, we repudiate every insinuation of the sort. That the majority of the people have strong feelings against the Catholic religion, nobody doubts; but, at the same time, we doubt just as little the honest intention of the great body of our people to treat their Catholic fellow-citizens as their equals before the law, and to administer the government fairly, and without undue

bias towards one religious denomination or another. The result, which we regret chiefly for the honor of our State, whose fair fame and unsullied honor are as dear to us as the apple of our eye, we believe to have been due solely to a temporary misapprehension of the question on which the House was called to act; and, having now cleared up the misapprehension and placed it before the public in its simplicity and in its real character, we leave it without the least misgiving as to the action of a future legislature.

ART. VI. — LITERARY NOTICES AND CRITICISMS.

1. — *The Sea-Lions: or the Lost Sealers.* By J. FENIMORE COOPER. New York: Stringer & Townsend. 1849. 2 vols. 12mo.

THERE was a time when the organs, or pretended organs, of public opinion in this country were all united and loud in their praises of Cooper as the greatest novelist of the age, denominating him, with as little taste as judgment, the “American Scott”; but for some years past they seem to have been almost equally united and loud in decrying him as a man, and in depreciating his merits as an author. He has ventured to think and write as a freeborn American, to intimate that the American national character is not exactly perfect nor regarded as exactly perfect by European nations, and that there is room for improvement; he has even gone so far as to point out some of our faults, to tell us that good-breeding is not necessarily incompatible with patriotism, that there is no necessary connection between ill-manners and democracy, and that a man may be a gentleman without ceasing to be a republican. In doing this he has given mortal offence to the two extremes of American society; — on the one hand, to the radicals, who are for levelling all distinctions, and making all equal, not only before God and the state, but before reason and fortune, in natural gifts and acquired possessions; and on the other, to our gutter aristocracy,* who, conscious of no inherent nobility, or intrinsic claims to notice or an honorable social position,

* By gutter aristocracy, we do not mean those who have *risen* from a low origin or condition, and by their talents and worth attained to honorable distinction; but those who have *remained* in the gutter, and become distinguished by the gold they have contrived to collect around them.

wish to substitute artificial for natural diversities of social rank and condition, and have them supported by some legal recognition or sanction. But, in all this, it may be that he deserves praise rather than censure, and that we should do better to understand and follow his counsels than to be angry with him for having given them.

Mr. Cooper's taste in some minor matters may, now and then, be questioned; his tone is sometimes arrogant, and his manner apparently egotistical; and it must be admitted that he tells us our faults, without much consideration for self-love, or regard to personal vanity, in a downright, earnest manner, that is sometimes harsh, and seldom politic. But he is a genuine patriot, keenly alive to the honor of his country, and willing to do all that man can do to raise her to that genuine prosperity every good man wishes for her, and to that high character in the estimation of the civilized world, to which she would be entitled if true to her own noble political institutions. His aims are just and honorable, and we have yet to learn that he has misapprehended the national character of his countrymen, or laid to their charge a single fault of which they are not guilty; and, severe as is his *Home as Found*, it is a book which every American citizen would do well, for some time to come at least, to read and meditate as often as once in every three months.

When Mr. Cooper went abroad, some years since, he carried with him a warm American heart, and an enthusiastic love of his country. He also, we should judge from his earlier writings, carried with him the false persuasion common to the great body of his countrymen, that our national character stands high in the estimation of foreigners, and that to be an American citizen is everywhere an honorable distinction. But he was not long in discovering that this persuasion is merely the result of national ignorance and vanity, and that our country is nowhere out of itself regarded as standing even on the ordinary level of civilized nations. Abroad, our national character is held in low esteem, almost in contempt, and we are looked upon as unprincipled, cunning, rapacious, — a nation of speculators and swindlers. The author of *The Spy* and *The Pioneers* could not endure this, and he sought to give to Europeans a more just and favorable view of his country. To this end he wrote and published his *Notions of the Americans, picked up by a Travelling Bachelor*. This work was the production of an enthusiastic American, who saw in his countrymen everything to admire, and nothing to censure. It over-praised us, but it was calculated to meet, and in some degree to soften, the prejudice imbibed against us. Its effect was considerable, and to its influence we may trace the more respectful and the more truthful tone in which subsequent European travellers have spoken of our character and institutions. For this work, faulty as it was, he should have received the thanks of the American people, for it was written and published

not without hazard to his European reputation. But, unhappily, his services in defence of the character of his country were far from being duly appreciated by his countrymen, and it was not long before his generous defence abroad of republicanism called forth bitter denunciations against him at home. Instead of corroborating the truth of what he ventured to assert by uniting as Americans to support him, the American press assailed him and did all in their power to confirm the despisers of our national character in the opinion they had previously formed of it. If, then, he has felt wounded, if he has shown some bitterness of feeling towards his assailants, if he has used little ceremony in telling them of their characteristic faults, and told them some unpalatable truths in a tone somewhat lofty, and in terms somewhat blunt, he has had sufficient provocation, and they have no right to complain. Indeed, they ought to congratulate themselves that he has not been more severe, and less discriminating in his censures. The editors who assail him, whether as a man or as an author, would show more good sense, if they would receive with meekness the wise admonitions and merited rebukes he has given them, and endeavour to improve their tempers, correct their principles, and cease to use their means of influence to debase their countrymen and ruin their country.

Mr. Cooper is an earnest-minded man, and, though a novelist, he is no trifler. Through all his works there runs a serious aim. In some of his earlier novels there is, perhaps, a little too much leaning towards the religion of nature, and not so deep a feeling of the importance and necessity of revealed religion as we could wish; in his series of novels the scenes of which he lays in Europe, there may, perhaps, be detected certain radical and socialistic tendencies which are to be regretted; but he is never really lax in his morals, never prurient in his fancies; we remember no sentence in all he has written that could raise a blush on the cheek of modesty, and we recall no scene attractive to a libertine taste, or that can sully the chastest imagination. He never scoffs; he is never irreverent; he never forgets that man is a moral being, accountable to his Maker for his thoughts, words, and deeds. This, as the times go, is high praise, and honorably distinguishes him from the herd of popular novelists and romancers. It gives him a claim to the love and gratitude of all pure-minded men and patriotic citizens.

We live so much out of the novel-reading world, that we do not know how the work before us, Mr. Cooper's latest publication, has been received; but, for ourselves, we think it the very best of his novels. It is equal in power and interest to his most popular works, and superior to them in its deep religious feeling and high moral tendency. We have found very little in it to which we can object, and very much that, under a moral and religious point of view, we can commend. The author is not a Catholic, but it would be

difficult for us to select a so-called Catholic novel which contains less than is repugnant to Catholic faith and morals. *The Sea-Lions* is as far superior in this respect to *Pauline Seward*, for instance, as it is in creative genius and literary execution; and abating a few expressions, which are merely incidental, we could give it an honorable place in what we call "Catholic secular literature." Its great design is to illustrate the doctrine of Divine Providence, to show the worthlessness and danger of talent, energy, and perseverance in the pursuit of wealth for its own sake, and to urge the importance, in all the relations of life, of accepting and conforming to the great truths of the Gospel, even though they are mysteries, and tend to humble the pride of reason. No recondite moral this, we grant, — nothing more than is encountered at the very threshold of the Christian religion, — but of the highest importance to be insisted upon in these days of philosophy, rationalism, and worldly-mindedness, and which no popular author can now insist upon without hazarding, in some degree, his literary reputation. The author has done no more than his duty, but we live in an age and country when we feel bound to be grateful to the man who will do even that, or, in fact, even do it only in part.

The execution of the work is superior to that which we ordinarily meet with in Cooper's novels. There is no straining for effect; the tone is subdued, and the manner is marked by that repose, the characteristic of strength, which we seldom meet with in our American authors. The characters are happily conceived and well sustained throughout. Roswell Gardiner is, indeed, nothing new, but Deacon Pratt, his niece Mary, and Captain Daggett of the Vineyard, are characters which Cooper has not before given us, and are in their way as original, as truthfully and as delicately drawn, as the character of the Leatherstocking himself.

We extract the following on deacons in general, and Deacon Pratt in particular: —

"There are two great species of deacons; for we suppose they must all be referred to the same *genera*. One species belong to the priesthood, and become priests and bishops; passing away, as priests and bishops are apt to do, with more or less of the savour of godliness. The other species are purely laymen, and are *sui generis*. They are, *ex officio*, the most pious men in a neighbourhood, as they sometimes are, as it would seem to us, *ex officio*, also the most grasping and mercenary. As we are not in the secrets of the sects to which these lay deacons belong, we shall not presume to pronounce whether the individual is elevated to the deaconate because he is prosperous in a worldly sense, or whether the prosperity is a consequence of the deaconate; but that the two usually go together is quite certain; which being the cause, and which the effect, we leave to wiser heads to determine.

"Deacon Pratt was no exception to the rule. A tighter-fisted sinner did not exist in the county than this pious soul, who certainly not only wore, but wore out, the 'form of godliness,' while he was devoted, heart

and hand, to the daily increase of worldly gear. No one spoke disparagingly of the deacon, notwithstanding. So completely had he got to be interwoven with the church — ‘meeting,’ we ought to say — in that vicinity, that speaking disparagingly of him would have appeared like assailing Christianity. It is true, that many an unfortunate fellow-citizen in Suffolk had been made to feel how close was the gripe of his hand, when he found himself in its grasp; but there is a way of practising the most ruthless extortion, that serves not only to deceive the world, but which would really seem to mislead the extortioner himself. Phrases take the place of deeds, sentiments those of facts, and grimaces those of benevolent looks, so ingeniously and so impudently, that the wronged often fancy that they are the victims of a severe dispensation of Providence, when the truth would have shown that they were simply robbed.

“We do not mean, however, that Deacon Pratt was a robber. He was merely a hard man in the management of his affairs; never cheating, in a direct sense, but seldom conceding a cent to generous impulses, or to the duties of kind. He was a widower, and childless, — circumstances that rendered his love of gain still less pardonable; for many a man, who is indifferent to money on his own account, will toil and save to lay up hoards for those who are to come after him. The deacon had only a niece to inherit his effects, unless he might choose to step beyond that degree of consanguinity, and bestow a portion of his means on cousins. The church — or, to be more literal, the ‘meeting’ — had an eye on his resources, however; and it was whispered it had actually succeeded, by means known to itself, in squeezing out of his tight grasp no less a sum than one hundred dollars, as a donation to a certain theological college. It was conjectured by some persons that this was only the beginning of a religious liberality, and that the excellent and godly-minded deacon would bestow most of his property in a similar way, when the moment should come that it could be no longer of any use to himself. This opinion was much in favor with divers devout females of the deacon’s congregation, who had daughters of their own, and who seldom failed to conclude their observations on this interesting subject with some such remark as, ‘Well, in that case, and it seems to me that everything points that way, Mary Pratt will get no more than any other poor man’s daughter.’

“Little did Mary, the only child of Israel Pratt, an elder brother of the deacon, think of all this. She had been left an orphan in her tenth year, both parents dying within a few months of each other, and had lived beneath her uncle’s roof for nearly ten more years, until use, and natural affection, and the customs of the country had made her feel absolutely at home there. A less interested or less selfish being than Mary Pratt never existed. In this respect she was the very antipodes of her uncle, who often stealthily rebuked her for her charities and acts of neighbourly kindness, which he was wont to term waste. But Mary kept the even tenor of her way, seemingly not hearing such remarks, and doing her duty quietly, and in all humility.

“Suffolk was settled originally by emigrants from New England, and the character of its people is, to this hour, of modified New England habits and notions. Now, one of the marked peculiarities of Connecticut is an indisposition to part with anything without a *quid pro quo*. Those little services, offerings, and conveniences, that are elsewhere parted with without a thought of remuneration, go regularly upon the day-book, and often reappear on a ‘settlement,’ years after they have been forgotten by

those who received the favors. Even the man who keeps a carriage will let it out for hire; and the manner in which money is accepted and even asked for by persons in easy circumstances, and for things that would be gratuitous in the Middle States, often causes disappointment, and sometimes disgust. In this particular, Scottish and Swiss thrift, both notorious, and the latter particularly so, are nearly equalled by New England thrift; more especially in the close estimate of the value of services rendered. So marked, indeed, is this practice of looking for requitals, that even the language is infected with it. Thus, should a person pass a few months by invitation with a friend, his visit is termed 'boarding'; it being regarded as a matter of course that he pays his way. It would scarcely be safe, indeed, without the precaution of 'passing receipts' on quitting, for one to stay any time in a New England dwelling, unless prepared to pay for his board. The free and frank habits that prevail among relatives and friends elsewhere are nearly unknown there, every service having its price. These customs are exceedingly repugnant to all who have been educated in different notions; yet are they not without their redeeming qualities, that might be pointed out to advantage, though our limits will not permit us, at this moment, so to do.

"Little did Mary Pratt suspect the truth; but habit, or covetousness, or some vague expectation that the girl might yet contract a marriage that would enable him to claim all his advances, had induced the deacon never to bestow a cent on her education, or dress, or pleasures of any sort, that the money was not regularly charged against her, in that nefarious work that he called his 'day-book.' As for the self-respect, and the feelings of caste, which prevent a gentleman from practising any of these tradesmen's tricks, the deacon knew nothing of them. He would have set the man down as a fool who deferred to any notions so unprofitable. With him, not only every *man*, but every *thing* 'had its price,' and usually it was a good price, too. At the very moment when our tale opens there stood charged in his book, against his unsuspecting and affectionate niece, items in the way of schooling, dress, board, and pocket-money, that amounted to the considerable sum of one thousand dollars, money fairly expended. The deacon was only intensely mean and avaricious, while he was as honest as the day. Not a cent was overcharged; and to own the truth, Mary was so great a favorite with him, that most of his charges against *her* were rather of a reasonable rate than otherwise."—Vol. I. pp. 16–19.

We must protest against the justice of the character here given to us New-Englanders, — a character far more applicable to those who go out from us than to those who remain at home, and to some portions of Connecticut bordering on New York than to New England generally. It has very little truth when applied to Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, or Maine, — States as remarkable for their hospitality, generosity, and liberal and manly sentiments, as they are for their industry, energy, and enterprise. The notions of the Yankee common in the Middle and Southern States are taken chiefly from Connecticut, — in fact, from Connecticut peddlers of tin-ware and wooden clocks, — and are as false when applied to the great body of the people of the New England States as when applied

to the middle or western sections of the Union. People in the State of New York ought to know that Connecticut is not all of New England; and any one who knows Connecticut knows very well that the peddlers are not a fair sample even of her population. The New England States have a great resemblance in their political and social institutions, and there is a general resemblance in the character and usages of the people of those States of which Boston is the metropolis. We say *metropolis*, for Boston has had, and still has, though it is fast losing it, a metropolitan character, — a character less provincial than any other city in the Union. But beneath all these general resemblances there are striking differences. The Connecticut man is as different from a Massachusetts man as a Pennsylvanian is from a Marylander, and either of these is as different from a Vermonter as a New-Yorker is from a Kentuckian. We speak without prejudice, for, though we were born in Vermont, we were brought up in the Middle States, and it has been our lot to love the South, to reside in the West, and to find a home in old Massachusetts.

New England is behind the other sections of the Union in her agricultural resources, and she has been compelled to turn her attention to trade, commerce, and manufactures. Her people are not, generally speaking, wealthy, and the great majority of her sons are obliged to start in life with little other capital than a good education, business capacity, and habits of industry; economy and frugality — thrift, if you will — have been inculcated from childhood as virtues, not for love of money as an end, but for the sake of independence. That such a people should be to a great extent worldly-minded, that they should be shrewd and successful business-men, was to be expected; but we have yet to learn that New-Englanders, though perhaps more methodical and more successful in what is called getting on in the world, are more attached to money, or less scrupulous as to the means employed in obtaining it, than the people of other sections of the Union. As far as we have observed, they are less mean and tricky in money matters, more just and honorable in their business transactions, than the people of either the Middle or the Western States. The traits of New England character, which Mr. Cooper brings out, are certainly to be detected here and there in New England, but they are not characteristic; and the bigotry and sectarianism he so justly satirizes in nearly all his novels are less marked in New England than in New York or Pennsylvania. We have very little Presbyterianism, the most odious of all the forms of Protestantism, and our Puritanism has been much softened by time. The things which the author finds most frequent occasion to censure in his *Homeward Bound*, or *Home as Found*, are hardly known in New England. His Aristabulus Brag, or his model editor, Steadfast Dodge, Esq., might

have been born in New England, but neither could have played the part he assigns him in any New England society. In New England there is more real equality than in any other section of the Union, and at the same time less vulgar tenacity in asserting it. The social distinctions which grow legitimately out of a difference of cultivation, manners, and tastes are cheerfully recognized, and, in general, every one falls, without murmuring or heart-burning, into his own rank, class, or set, where he is at home and can enjoy himself. In any part of New England, there is *society* in Mr. Cooper's sense of the word, because we have an old, permanent population, born where they live, and not a miscellaneous population, made up of strangers and adventurers from all parts of the country, and from every quarter of the globe. At least, such is as yet the fact, but how long it will be so in our principal towns we are unable to say. We think, however, that it will remain so, for what Mr. Cooper calls the "movers" go out from us, as not being of us; and few adventurers are likely to come from other parts of the Union to settle, or even bivouac, among us.

Littleliness, meanness, low cunning, legal honesty and moral dishonesty in money matters, may certainly be found in New England; and we have quite too many Deacon Pratts and Captain Daggetts, we own; but, relatively to the other sections of the Union, we have our full and more than our full share of high-minded and liberal men,—men of talents, cultivation, and manners, who are an honor to any country; and nothing is more false than the common notions elsewhere entertained of the Yankee character. We challenge the world to produce a finer specimen of the gentleman than the well-bred and cultivated Bostonian. Bigotry we certainly have, as well as religious indifference, and fanaticism in regard to temperance and abolitionism has certainly seized a fraction of our population; but at the same time these things find here their ablest and most energetic opponents, and there is not one of the Middle States in which public opinion interferes less despotically with individual freedom. So much, as not being a Bostonian, and hardly a Yankee, we have felt that we might say without impropriety, or subjecting ourselves to Mr. Cooper's charge of provincialism. To our own heart our country is one, and we dislike all these sectional divisions. We love our whole country, and mean to be true to it, "however bounded"; but we protest against the opinions in regard to New-Englanders which we find in almost every American book written by men born in other parts of the Union,—not for the sake of New England, who needs no defence, but for the sake of her assailants.

We have been led farther than we intended in these remarks, which we have made less for Mr. Cooper than for some others. We return to the work before us. We have little room for extracts, but we must express our warm affection for Mary Pratt, a pure-minded

and excellent girl, the very best female character in her walk in life Mr. Cooper has ever drawn. She has pure, deep, strong affection, and high, uncompromising religious principle. She loves Roswell Gardiner, but though her heart break she will not give him her hand as long as he remains a Unitarian, for she will not form the most intimate and sacred union which two human beings can form with one whose God is not her God. We cannot resist the temptation to extract the following, which we commend to those of our Catholic friends who see no harm in mixed marriages.

“The young sailor left the wharf at Sag Harbour about ten minutes after the deacon had preceded him, on his way to the schooner. As the wind was so light and so fair, he soon had his sheets in, and the boat gliding along at an easy rate, which permitted him to bestow nearly all his attention on his charming companion. Roswell Gardiner had sought this occasion, that he might once more open his heart to Mary, and urge his suit for the last time, previously to so long an absence. This he did in a manly, frank way, that was far from being unpleasant to his gentle listener, whose inclinations, for a few minutes, blinded her to the resolutions already made on principle. So urgent was her suitor, indeed, that she should solemnly plight her faith to him, ere he sailed, that a soft illusion came over the mind of one as affectionate as Mary, and she was half inclined to believe her previous determination was unjustifiable and obdurate. But the head of one of her high principles, and clear views of duty, could not long be deceived by her heart, and she regained the self-command which had hitherto sustained her in all her former trials, in connection with this subject.

“ ‘Perhaps it would have been better, Roswell,’ she said, ‘had I taken leave of you at the Harbour, and not incurred the risk of the pain that I foresee I shall both give and bear in our present discourse. I have concealed nothing from you; possibly I have been more sincere than prudence would sanction. You know the only obstacle there is to our union; but that appears to increase in strength, the more I ask you to reflect on it, — to try to remove it.’

“ ‘What would you have me do, Mary? Surely, not to play the hypocrite, and profess to believe that which I certainly do not, and which, after all my inquiries, I *cannot* believe.’

“ ‘I am sorry it is so, on every account,’ returned Mary, in a low and saddened tone. ‘Sorry, that one of so frank, ingenuous a mind should find it impossible to accept the creed of his fathers, and sorry that it must leave so impassable a chasm between us, for ever.’

“ ‘No, Mary; that can never be! Nothing but death can separate us for so long a time! While we meet, we shall at least be friends; and friends love to meet and to see each other often.’

“ ‘It may seem unkind, at a moment like this, Roswell, but it is in truth the very reverse, if I say we ought not to meet each other here, if we are bent on following our own separate ways towards a future world. My God is not your God; and what can there be of peace in a family, when its two heads worship different deities? I am afraid that you do not think sufficiently of the nature of these things.’

“ ‘I did not believe you to be so illiberal, Mary! Had the deacon said

as much, I might not have been surprised ; but for one like you to tell me that my God is not your God is narrow indeed !’

“ ‘ Is it not so, Roswell ? And if so, why should we attempt to gloss over the truth by deceptive words ? I am a believer in the Redeemer, as the Son of God, as one of the Holy Trinity ; while you believe in him only as a man, — a righteous and just, a sinless man, if you will, but as a man only. Now, is not the difference in these creeds immense ? Is it not, in truth, just the difference between God and man ? I worship my Redeemer ; regard him as the equal of the Father, — as a part of that Divine Being ; while you look on him as merely a man without sin, — as a man such as Adam probably was before the fall.’ ”

“ ‘ Do we know enough of these matters, Mary, to justify us in allowing them to interfere with our happiness ? ’ ”

“ ‘ We are told that they are all-essential to our happiness, — not in the sense you may mean, Roswell, but in one of far higher import, — and we cannot neglect them, without paying the penalty.’ ”

“ ‘ I think you carry these notions too far, dearest Mary, and that it is possible for man and wife most heartily to love each other, and to be happy in each other, without their thinking exactly alike on religion. How many good and pious women do you see, who are contented and prosperous as wives and mothers, and who are members of meeting, but whose husbands make no profession of any sort ! ’ ”

“ ‘ That may be true, or not. I lay no claim to a right to judge of any others’ duties, or manner of viewing what they ought to do. Thousands of girls marry without *feeling* the very obligations that they profess to reverence ; and when, in after life, deeper convictions come, they cannot cast aside the connections they have previously formed, if they would ; and probably would not, if they could. That is a different thing from a young woman, who has a deep sense of what she owes to her Redeemer, becoming deliberately, and with a full sense of what she is doing, the wife of one who regards her God as merely a man. I care not how you qualify this opinion, by saying a pure and sinless man ; it will be man, still. The difference between God and man is too immense to be frittered away by any such qualifications as that.’ ”

“ ‘ But, if I find it *impossible* to believe all you believe, Mary, surely you would not punish me for having the sincerity to tell you the truth, and the whole truth.’ ”

“ ‘ No, indeed, Roswell,’ answered the honest girl, gently, not to say tenderly. ‘ Nothing has given me a better opinion of your principles, Roswell, — a higher notion of what your upright and frank character really is, than the manly way in which you have admitted the justice of my suspicions of your want of faith, — of faith, as I consider faith can alone exist. This fair dealing has made me honor you, and esteem you, in addition to the more girlish attachment that I do not wish to conceal from you, at least, I have so long felt.’ ”

“ ‘ Blessed Mary ! ’ exclaimed Roswell Gardiner, almost ready to fall down on his knees and worship the pretty enthusiast, who sat at his side with a countenance in which intense interest in his welfare was beaming from two of the softest and sweetest blue eyes that maiden ever bent on a youth in modest tenderness, whatever disposition he might be in to accept her God as his God. ‘ How can one so kind in all other respects prove so cruel in this one particular ! ’ ”

“ ‘ Because that one particular, as you term it, Roswell, is all in all to

her,' answered the girl, with a face that was now flushed with feeling. 'I must answer you as Joshua told the Israelites of old, — "Choose you, this day, whom you will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served, that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: *but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.*"'

"Do you class me with the idolaters and pagans of Palestine?' demanded Gardiner, reproachfully.

"You have said it, Roswell. It is not I, but yourself, who have thus classed you. You worship your reason, instead of the one true and living God. This is idolatry of the worst character, since the idol is never seen by the devotee, and he does not know of its existence.'

"You consider it, then, idolatry for one to use those gifts which he has received from his Maker, and to treat the most important of all subjects as a rational being, instead of receiving a creed blindly, and without thought."

"If what you call thought could better the matter, if it were sufficient to comprehend and master this subject, there might be force in what you say. But what is this boasted reason, after all? It is not sufficient to explain a single mystery of the creation, though there are thousands. I know there are, nay, there *must* be, a variety of opinions among those who look to their reasons, instead of accepting the doctrine of revelation, for the character of Christ; but I believe all, who are not open infidels, admit that the atonement of his death was sufficient for the salvation of men: now, can you explain this part of the theory of our religion any more than you can explain the divine nature of the Redeemer? Can you *reason* any more wisely touching the fall, than touching the redemption itself? I know I am unfit to treat of matters of this profound nature,' continued Mary, modestly, though with great earnestness and beauty of manner; 'but, to me, it seems very plain, that, the instant circumstances lead us beyond the limits of our means of comprehension, we are to *believe* in, and not to reason on, revelation. The whole history of Christianity teaches this. Its first ministers were uneducated men; men who were totally ignorant until enlightened by their faith; and all the lessons it teaches are to raise faith, and faith in the Redeemer, high above all other attainments, as the one great acquisition that includes and colors every other. When such is the fact, the heart does not make a stumbling-block of everything that the head cannot understand.'

"I do not know how it is,' answered Roswell Gardiner, influenced, though unconvinced; 'but when I talk with you on this subject, Mary, I cannot do justice to my opinions, or to the manner in which I reason on them with my male friends and acquaintance. I confess it does appear to me illogical, unreasonable, — I scarce know how to designate what I mean, — but improbable, that God should suffer himself, or his Son, to be crucified by beings that he himself created, or that he should feel a necessity for any such course, in order to redeem beings he had himself brought into existence.'

"If there be any argument in the last, Roswell, it is an argument as much against the crucifixion of a man as against the crucifixion of one of the Trinity itself. I understand you to believe that such a being as Jesus of Nazareth did exist; that he was crucified for our redemption; and that the atonement was accepted and acceptable before God the Father. Now, is it not just as difficult to understand how, or why, this should be, as to understand the common creed of Christians?"

“ ‘Surely, there is a vast difference between the crucifixion of a subordinate being, and the crucifixion of one who made a part of the Godhead itself, Mary! I can imagine the first, though I may not pretend to understand its reasons, or why it was necessary it should be so; but I am certain you will not mistake my motive when I say, I cannot imagine the other.’

“ ‘Make no apologies to me, Roswell; look rather to that dread Being whose teachings, through chosen ministers, you disregard. As for what you say, I can fully feel its truth. I do not pretend to *understand* why such a sacrifice should be necessary, but I *believe* it, *feel* it; and believing and feeling it, I cannot but adore and worship the Son, who quitted heaven to come on earth, and suffered, that we might possess eternal life. It is all mystery to me, as is the creation itself, our existence, God himself, and all else that my mind is too limited to comprehend. But, Roswell, if I believe a part of the teachings of the Christian Church, I must believe all. The apostles, who were called by Christ in person, who lived in his very presence, who knew nothing except as the Holy Spirit prompted, worshipped him as the Son of God, as one “who thought it not robbery to be equal with God”; and shall I, ignorant and uninspired, pretend to set up my feeble means of reasoning in opposition to their written instructions?’

“ ‘Yet must each of us stand or fall by the means he possesses, and the use he makes of them.’

“ ‘That is quite true, Roswell; and ask yourself the use to which you put your own faculties. I do not deny that we are to exercise our reason, but it is within the bounds set for its exercise. We may examine the evidence of Christianity, and determine for ourselves how far it is supported by reasonable and sufficient proofs; beyond this we cannot be expected to go, else might we be required to comprehend the mystery of our own existence, which just as much exceeds our understanding as any other. We are told that man was created in the image of his Creator, which means that there is an immortal and spiritual part of him that is entirely different from the material creature. One perishes, temporarily at least, — a limb can be severed from the body and perish, even while the body survives; but it is not so with that which has been created in the image of the Deity. That is imperishable, immortal, spiritual, though doomed to dwell awhile in a tenement of clay. Now, why is it more difficult to believe that pure divinity may have entered into the person of one man, than to *believe*, nay, to *feel*, that the image of God has entered into the persons of so many myriads of men? You not only overlook all this, Roswell, but you commit the, to me inexplicable, mistake of believing a part of a mystery, while you hesitate about believing all. Were you to deny the merits of the atonement altogether, your position would be much stronger than it is in believing what you do. But, Roswell, we will not embitter the moment of separation by talking more on this subject now. I have other things to say to you, and but little time to say them in. The promise you have asked of me to remain single until your return, I most freely make. It costs me nothing to give you *this* pledge, since there is scarce a possibility of my ever marrying another.’ ” — Vol. 1. pp. 98 – 104.

2. — *The Four Gospels, translated from the Latin Vulgate, and diligently compared with the Original Greek Text, being a Revision of the Rhemish Translation, with Notes Critical and Explanatory.* By FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK, Bishop of Philadelphia. New York: Dunigan & Brother. 1849. 8vo. pp. 572.

THE Messrs. Dunigan have sent out this excellent volume in a dress far superior to that in which our Catholic publications usually appear, for which they deserve our hearty thanks and the hearty thanks of all readers. We welcome the volume, also, as a proof that the demand for Catholic books is rapidly increasing, and that the taste of Catholic readers is rapidly improving. We trust the time is not far distant when we shall have in this country a Catholic public large enough and wealthy enough to support our booksellers, and encourage the labors of our authors in any department of literature or science they may choose to cultivate.

Of the work itself before us, we are hardly qualified to speak. Though a reviewer by profession, we are not of the class who know all things and some others. There are subjects of which we know too little to be authorized to express even an opinion. It would be presumptuous in us to attempt to criticize such a work as the present, and for us to commend a work by the learned and illustrious Bishop of Philadelphia would be simply impertinence. All we can say is, that, as far as we have found leisure to compare the translation with the original, it appears to be faithful, and not unfrequently felicitous. The style of the translation is good, and preserves the simplicity of the ancient translation without being antiquated. The Notes, critical and explanatory, we have found interesting and instructive. They elucidate most of the obscurities of the Sacred Text, and justify the reading and the rendering adopted. As a work for Biblical students, engaged in the critical study of the Holy Scriptures, it must possess a high value, and it is, under any point of view, the most important contribution to the branch of Catholic literature to which it pertains, that has recently, or to our knowledge ever, been made in the English tongue, — although we are bound to add, that this is by no means saying as much as some might imagine. Saving a few ascetic books abominably translated from the Latin or some of the Continental tongues, and several very respectable controversial works on the points usually disputed between us and a few of the Protestant sects, our Catholic *English* literature is, to our shame, among the things that are not. We cannot study in English a single art or science, nay, cannot teach our children the simple rudiments of an English education, without the aid of our heretical and schismatical neighbours. If the learned doctors and scholars, so numerous among us, would each be half as industrious in some department to which his genius and attainments are adapted as the learned Bishop of Philadelphia is in the several departments he cultivates, we should soon rise to literary independence, and be able to collect an English library not unadapted to the wants and tastes of a cultivated Catholic family. We thank the eminent prelate for this contribution to Catholic Biblical literature, and hope we shall find others to imitate his example.

3. — *The Eucharistic Month; or Thirty-one Days' Preparation and Thanksgiving for the Holy Communion, useful to Priests and all who often Communicate. Translated into English, and revised by a Catholic Clergyman. To which is added, Devout Entertainments on the Holy Sacrament of the Altar.* Philadelphia: McGrath. 1849. 24mo. pp. 176.

THIS is an admirable work, the very best of its class we are acquainted with. We speak of the book as the author wrote it, not as it stands before us in its pretended English dress. We know not who is the Catholic clergyman who has revised the translation, and it is some relief to us that we do not. He is, no doubt, a pious man and a good priest, but he does not happen to be master of the English tongue. This is nothing to his discredit as a holy man, but it is a serious drawback upon his merits as a translator. The simple fact is, that the translations of popular works which are circulated amongst us are, in general, without any exaggeration, execrable. They appear to be made either by foreigners who have only an imperfect knowledge of English, or by persons who, though not foreigners by birth, have been so accustomed to read, think, and pray in a foreign language, that they have lost the proper use of their mother tongue. The translator of the work before us is either a Frenchman, or one who has been accustomed to perform his devotions and to make his meditations in French, or at least accustomed to use ascetic works in which the French idiom is retained. We mean in this no disrespect to the Frenchmen or to the French language, but we do mean to protest against Frenchifying our own mother tongue. We are in the habit of conversing with our Father and our Redeemer in English, and we suppose this to be the case with the great majority of those for whom translations into English are needed.

The translator, in direct addresses to the Supreme Being, to the Father, the Son, or the Holy Ghost, invariably, as far as we have observed, uses the pronouns of the second person in the plural number. This is proper in French, but in English borders on levity or profanity. *You* applied to God affects an Englishman precisely as *tu* applied to him would affect a Frenchman. In French, the singular is familiar, and can be properly used only by equals and intimates; in English, the plural is familiar, and can never be applied when the address is to God, or *nakedly* even to persons of dignity. We listened, some time since, to an admirable sermon by a most excellent priest, loved and revered for his piety and his zeal, and yet the constant use of the plural instead of the singular in his frequent addresses to our Maker and Redeemer, our Father and our Friend, shocked us, and deprived us of the edification his admirable sermon was otherwise fitted to give. We can hardly take up a devotional or ascetic work in which we do not find the same violation of the English idiom. Why is this so? Does piety disdain good taste, and regard it as a merit to discard purity of language? Why cannot a little more attention be paid by our translators to the genius of our tongue, and some pains be taken to elevate our hearts to God without barbarizing our language?

The translator of the work commits other faults which should be corrected. Addressing our Lord under the figure of the sun, — Sun of justice, which the printer makes *Son* of justice, — he says, "Lovely Sun, warm me, — lovely Sun, enlighten me," &c. This is intolerable. Usage

has made *lovely*, as here applied, wholly inadmissible, and the expression is neither sufficiently elevated nor sufficiently affectionate. *Lovely*, when taken alone, or when not reinforced and elevated by the turn of the phrase, is an inadequate translation of the French *aimable*, or the Latin *amabilis*, as used by ascetic writers. The English is not, we own, a language of phrases, like the French, but it makes the *phrase* of some importance in determining the sense or appropriateness of single words, — a fact never to be lost sight of by those who wish to write it idiomatically. It is not for us to say what term the translator should have used, but, if he chose to retain the construction, *amiable*, *beautiful*, *sweet*, or *dear* would have been preferable to *lovely*. In the case before us, writing in English, we should without hesitation have written, “*Dear Sun, warm me,*” which is, to the English reader, as forcible as *amabilis* or *aimable*, and more affectionate. It expresses the loveliness intended by expressing its effect, and enlivens the abstract by making it concrete. It is English, and in accordance with good English usage. The English language is far from being so cold as is commonly imagined, as might be inferred from the fact that it always prefers the concrete, and has a dislike for abstract terms. It is the language of living men, — of warm, living, loving hearts, — and it is cold and repulsive only because, in using it, instead of following its own genius, we try to conform it to the genius of languages with which it has very little affinity. If in writing, as in ordinary conversation, we would forget the forms of expression and the terms we have become familiar with in the learned languages or in the languages derived from them, we should soon find ourselves able to express in it all the ideas and affections we wish to express. The English term or phrase often dissatisfies us solely because, in our own minds, the thought or affection intended to be expressed is associated with a term or phrase of another language, and we fail to perceive the beauty or force of the English term or phrase. The simple fact is, very few of us know our own language well enough to be able to translate into it works from other tongues; and seldom should a translation be permitted to appear in public till it has passed under the revision of some good English scholar who has no knowledge of the original.

4. — *Macaulay's History*. — Domestic afflictions have prevented the writer from whom we expected a review of this work from preparing it in season for this number of our journal. Those of our readers who may be disappointed will find an able, and, except in what relates to Catholics, a just, review of it in a recent number of the *London Quarterly Review*, which proves that, however brilliant Mr. Macaulay may be as a writer, he is worthy of no confidence or respect as an historian.

* * WE cannot resist the temptation to publish the following letter, designed to approve and encourage our humble labors in the cause of Catholic literature. The letter was as unexpected as it is kind and cheering, and we are utterly at a loss to express our deep sense of the high testimony it bears to our Review. No higher testimonial could be asked, and no higher, out of Rome, could be given; and to say we are grateful is to say nothing. We thank the eminent prelate who drew up

the letter, and each and all of the illustrious Archbishops and Bishops who generously signed it, and gave us their approbation and a pledge of their support. It was more than we deserved, more than we can deserve, more than any editor can deserve; but we will do our best not to make them regret their generous act. We should be oppressed with their approbation, did we not know that, whatever merits this journal may have, as a Catholic journal, they are due not to us, but principally to the distinguished Bishop of this diocese and his venerable and learned clergy, who have always been ready to instruct our ignorance, and to advise and direct us in the course proper for such a journal to pursue, and in the proper views to be taken of the several important theological questions we have discussed. To them pertain the merits of the Review, — to us alone its faults and imperfections, which we hope will diminish with time and experience. The letter is signed by both the Archbishops, and by every one of the prelates assembled in the Council recently held in Baltimore, whom we thank again and again for their act of unexpected and spontaneous kindness.

Baltimore, 13th May, 1849.

DEAR SIR, —

After the close of our Council, I suggested to our venerable metropolitan the propriety of encouraging you by our approbation and influence to continue your literary labors in defence of the faith, of which you have proved an able and intrepid advocate. He received the suggestion most readily, and I take the liberty of communicating the fact to you, as a mark of my sincere esteem, and of the deep interest I feel in your excellent Review. I shall beg of him and of other prelates who entertain the same views, to subscribe their names in confirmation of my statement.

Your very devoted friend,

† FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK,

Bishop of Philadelphia.

O. A. BROWNSON, Esq.

- † SAMUEL, Archbishop of Baltimore
- † PETER RICHARD, Archbishop of St. Louis.
- † MICHAEL, Bishop of Mobile.
- † ANTHONY, Bishop of New Orleans.
- † JOHN JOSEPH, Bishop of Natchez.
- † JOHN, Bishop of Buffalo.
- † M. O'CONNOR, Bishop of Pittsburg.
- † MATHIAS, Bishop of Dubuque.
- † JOHN M. ODIN, Bishop of Galveston.
- † MARTIN JOHN, Bishop of Lengone, and Coadjutor of Louisville.
- † M. DE ST. PALAIS, Bishop of Vincennes.
- † WILLIAM TYLER, Bishop of Hartford.
- † J. B. FITZPATRICK, Bishop of Boston.
- † RICHARD PIUS, Bishop of Nashville.
- † JOHN BAPTIST, Bishop of Cincinnati.
- † JOHN HUGHES, Bishop of New York.
- † RICHARD VINCENT, Bishop of Richmond.
- † JAMES OLIVER, Bishop of Chicago.
- † JOHN M. HENNI, Bishop of Milwaukee.
- † JOHN, Bishop of Albany.
- † AMEDEUS, Bishop of Cleveland.
- † PETER PAUL, Bishop Zela Coadjutor Administrator of Detroit.
- † IGNATIUS AL. REYNOLDS, Bishop of Charleston.
- † ANDREW BYRNES, Bishop of Little Rock.